



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 14, 2008

No. 115

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 14, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

On this Monday in July, Lord, Congress seeks Your blessing as it gathers

to take up its work of policy and legislation for the United States of America.

The problems facing the Nation, the concerns of its citizens, as well as life itself, will not be settled with simplistic solutions. Since the light of truth is sought in every corner of economic darkness, and energy is needed to sustain every aspect of contemporary life, we stand humbly before You admitting our limitations.

Lord, give the Members of the House of Representatives the ability to listen intently to differing opinions and respond creatively. May their faith in You be strong enough to stretch every self-interest to the broader vision of the common good, expecting Your intervention in ordered routine or Your radical twist to basic intent.

Thus may all seek Your wisdom to guide this government and this Nation now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 14, 2008, at 12:42 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4289.

That the Senate passed S. 1046.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H. Con. Res. 236.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,
LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.
(By Deborah M. Spriggs, Deputy Clerk).

CONGRATULATIONS TO DR. HARRIS PASTIDES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina unanimously selected Dr. Harris Pastides as the 28th president of the university since 1801. Prior to his being selected as president of USC, Dr. Pastides had been Vice President for Research and Health Sciences. His appointment completes a long and thorough selection process chaired by Trustee Miles Loadholt of Barnwell, and I commend the university on their extraordinary work in choosing a strong and capable individual to lead the university.

As an alumnus of USC law school, I cherish the relationship the university

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6411

continues to form with the South Carolina community, and its national leadership in areas of research and discovery; most notably, the university's research in biomedical technology, as well as fuel cell and hydrogen technology. I welcome Dr. Pastides' and his wife Patricia's dedication to these goals.

I wish to thank Dr. Andrew Sorensen and his wife, Donna, for their remarkable leadership of the university for the past 6 years.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

POST OFFICE CONGRESS

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, almost every morning I talk to my parents who are both in their 80s and are very inquisitive about what goes on in Congress.

Today, like most Mondays, I tell them we are working on postal legislation. I don't really go further and tell them the legislation actually is just naming post office buildings throughout the vast plains and prairies of America. After all, we have named 72 Federal buildings in Congress.

According to the Wall Street Journal, almost 30 percent of our legislation passed this Congress has been naming Federal buildings. Today I see we will be naming two more post offices.

Today Mom said she can't even afford gas to get to the post office. Mr. Speaker, maybe this "Drill Nothing Congress" should find more energy for Americans. Open up the Outer Continental Shelf to crude oil. Congress needs to get to work and solve the gasoline issue. We can name post office buildings at some other time.

There has been enough talk about energy. Now action is demanded. However, it seems when all is said and done, more is said than done about the energy problem. Maybe we should rename our Congress the Post Office Congress.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5618) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5618

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided therein, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 202(a) (33 U.S.C. 1121(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) encourage the development of preparation, forecast, analysis, mitigation, response, and recovery systems for coastal hazards;”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “program of research, education,” and inserting “program of integrated research, education, extension,”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6) The National Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy issued by the National Science and Technology Council's Joint Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology on January 26, 2007, identifies research priorities for compelling areas of interaction between society and the ocean, and calls for the engagement of a broad array of ocean science sectors (government, academia, industry, and non-government entities) to address the areas of greatest research need and opportunity.

“(7) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through the national sea grant college program, offers the most suitable locus and means for such commitment and engagement through the promotion of activities that will result in greater such understanding, assessment, development, utilization, and conservation. The most cost-effective way to promote such activities is through continued and increased Federal support of the establishment, development, and operation of programs and projects by sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, and other institutions, including strong collaborations between Administration scientists and research and outreach personnel at academic institutions.”.

(b) PURPOSE.—Section 202(c) (33 U.S.C. 1121(c)) is amended by striking “to promote research, education, training, and advisory service activities” and inserting “to promote integrated research, education, training, and extension activities”.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 203 (33 U.S.C. 1122) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11) by striking “advisory services” and inserting “extension services”;

(2) in each of paragraphs (12) and (13) by striking “(33 U.S.C. 1126)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The term ‘regional research and information plan’ means a plan developed by one or more sea grant colleges or sea grant

institutes that identifies regional priorities to implement the National Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy.

“(18) The term ‘National Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy’ means such plan and strategy issued by the National Science and Technology Council's Joint Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology on January 26, 2007.”.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 307 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the designation of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary” (Public Law 102-251; 106 Stat. 66) is repealed.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM, GENERALLY.

(a) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Section 204(b) (33 U.S.C. 1123(b)) is amended—

(1) by amending in paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) sea grant programs that comprise a national sea grant college program network, including international projects conducted within such programs and regional and national projects conducted among such programs;”;

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) administration of the national sea grant college program and this title by the national sea grant office and the Administration;”;

(3) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) any regional or national strategic investments in fields relating to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources developed in consultation with the board and with the approval of the sea grant colleges and the sea grant institutes.”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 204(c)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(2)) is amended by striking “Within 6 months of the date of enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1998, the” and inserting “The”.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.—Section 204(d) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “long-range”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) by striking “(A)(i) evaluate” and inserting “(A) evaluate and assess”;

(B) by striking “activities; and” and inserting “activities;”;

(C) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses (iv) through (vi), respectively, and by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) encourage collaborations among sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes to address regional and national priorities established under subsection (c)(1);

“(iii) encourage cooperation with Minority Serving Institutions—

“(I) to enhance collaborative research opportunities for faculty and students in the areas of atmospheric, oceanic, and environmental sciences, and remote sensing;

“(II) to improve opportunities for, and retention of, students and faculty from Minority Serving Institutions in the NOAA related sciences; and

“(III) to increase the number of such students graduating in NOAA science areas;”;

(B) in clause (iv) (as so redesignated) by striking “encourage” and inserting “ensuring”.

SEC. 6. PROGRAM OR PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

(a) EXEMPTION FROM LIMITATION ON COST SHARE.—Section 205(a) (33 U.S.C. 1124(a)) is

amended in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting "or that are appropriated under section 208(b)" before the period at the end.

(b) SPECIAL GRANTS; MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—Section 205(b) (33 U.S.C. 1124(b)) is amended by striking the matter following paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"The total amount that may be provided for grants under this subsection during any fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 5 percent of the total funds appropriated for such year under section 212."

SEC. 7. EXTENSION SERVICES BY SEA GRANT COLLEGES AND SEA GRANT INSTITUTES.

Section 207(a) (33 U.S.C. 1126(a)) is amended in each of paragraphs (2)(B) and (3)(B) by striking "advisory services" and inserting "extension services".

SEC. 8. FELLOWSHIPS.

(a) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FELLOWSHIPS.—Section 208 (33 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts available for fellowships under this section, including amounts accepted under section 204(c)(4)(F) or appropriated under section 212 to implement this section, shall be used only for award of such fellowships and administrative costs of implementing this section."

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 208(a) (33 U.S.C. 1127(a)) is amended by striking "Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002, and every 2 years thereafter," and inserting "Every 2 years,".

SEC. 9. NATIONAL SEA GRANT ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF SEA GRANT REVIEW PANEL AS BOARD.—

(1) REDESIGNATION.—The sea grant review panel established by section 209 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1128), as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act, is redesignated as the National Sea Grant Advisory Board.

(2) MEMBERSHIP NOT AFFECTED.—An individual serving as a member of the sea grant review panel immediately before the enactment of this Act may continue to serve as a member of the National Sea Grant Advisory Board until the expiration of such member's term under section 209(c) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1128(c)).

(3) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to such sea grant review panel is deemed to be a reference to the National Sea Grant Advisory Board.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 209 (33 U.S.C. 1128) is amended by striking so much as precedes subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 209. NATIONAL SEA GRANT ADVISORY BOARD.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be an independent committee to be known as the National Sea Grant Advisory Board."

(B) DEFINITION.—Section 203(9) (33 U.S.C. 1122(9)) is amended to read as follows:

"(9) The term 'Board' means the National Sea Grant Advisory Board established under section 209."

(C) OTHER PROVISIONS.—The following provisions are each amended by striking "panel" each place it appears and inserting "Board":

(i) Section 204 (33 U.S.C. 1123).

(ii) Section 207 (33 U.S.C. 1126).

(iii) Section 209 (33 U.S.C. 1128).

(b) DUTIES.—Section 209(b) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) DUTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall advise the Secretary and the Director concerning—

"(A) strategies for utilizing the sea grant college program to address the Nation's highest priorities regarding the understanding, assessment, development, utilization, and conservation of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources;

"(B) the designation of sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes; and

"(C) such other matters as the Secretary refers to the Board for review and advice.

"(2) BIENNIAL REPORT.—The Board shall report to the Congress every two years on the state of the national sea grant college program. The Board shall indicate in each such report the progress made toward meeting the priorities identified in the strategic plan in effect under section 204(c). The Secretary shall make available to the Board such information, personnel, and administrative services and assistance as it may reasonably require to carry out its duties under this title."

(c) EXTENSION OF TERM.—Section 209(c)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1128(c)(2)) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "The Director may extend the term of office of a voting member of the Board once by up to 1 year."

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—Section 204(c) (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(8) The Board may establish such subcommittees as are reasonably necessary to carry out its duties under subsection (b). Such subcommittees may include individuals who are not Board members."

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 212(a) (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title—

"(1) \$66,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

"(2) \$72,800,000 for fiscal year 2010;

"(3) \$79,600,000 for fiscal year 2011;

"(4) \$86,400,000 for fiscal year 2012;

"(5) \$93,200,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

"(6) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2014."

(b) REPEAL OF DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.—Section 212 (33 U.S.C. 1131) is amended by striking subsection (c), and by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5618, the National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2008, is legislation that I introduced this past March. The bill reauthorizes the National Sea Grant College Program Act to improve marine resource conservation, management and utilization.

Sea Grant Colleges sponsor a wide range of applied and basic marine

science research, education, training and technical assistance programs promoting the understanding, the assessment, the development, the utilization and the conservation of ocean, coastal and Great Lakes resources. The reauthorization bill affords the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration the ability and the flexibility to strengthen the current network of Sea Grant Colleges and their collaborating institutions through fiscal year 2014. It does so based on the sensible recommendation of the Sea Grant Association, the Sea Grant Review Panel, the National Sea Grant Program Office, and other stakeholders.

By reauthorizing this program, the opportunity for enlisting more partnering institutions and increasing the overall number of designated Sea Grant Colleges remains. Capacity building for eventual Sea Grant College designation is ongoing at several institutions. And I note that in reauthorizing the program, H.R. 5618 keeps intact in current law the authority for NOAA to provide administrative, technical and financial assistance to institutions preparing and aiming for eventual Sea Grant College designation. The current eligibility criteria have ensured ultimate success with the entire program.

The University of Guam, in my district, Mr. Speaker, continues to plan for eventual designation. I support NOAA's efforts to assist with capacity building at the University of Guam and at other institutions in the Western Pacific region and across the United States that are working to develop the expertise and resources necessary to be designated a Sea Grant Institution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I note that in reauthorizing the overall program, we also renewed the authority for the continuation of the highly successful Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship program. Several of us here serving in Congress have had the extraordinary opportunity to host a legislative Sea Grant Fellow in our office. The skill and the competency of the Sea Grant fellows are a testament to the strength and the depth of the Sea Grant College program. The contributions of Sea Grant fellows in both the executive and the legislative branches have helped ensure policy is both crafted and implemented with an invaluable science perspective.

In reauthorizing the National Sea Grant College Program, Congress reaffirms its national value to protecting our human and our environmental health to the design and the utilization of sustainable development practices, and to the overall advancement of important research and extensive activities in the Marine Sciences.

With our support, the network of Sea Grant Colleges is positioned to continue collaborative ground-breaking research and engagement in the Marine Sciences with stakeholders in communities all across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask Members on both sides to support passage of this noncontroversial bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the majority, capably led by Congresswoman MADELEINE BORDALLO of the Republic of Guam, has superbly explained the bill. The National Sea Grant College Program has been an important component in addressing local and regional research for needs for ocean and Great Lakes issues. The program, such as the one at Buford, South Carolina, has been extremely effective in disseminating science-based information to citizens through education and outreach programs.

H.R. 5618 reauthorizes this important marine science program, and I support its passage with particular appreciation for the Buford Laboratory.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this particular piece of legislation. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for his supportive remarks.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5618, amending the National Sea Grant College Program Act and reauthorizing the program that is scheduled to expire fiscal year 2008.

First and foremost, I want to commend Congresswoman BORDALLO of Guam, Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Oceans of the Committee on Natural Resources, for taking the initiative to introduce this important legislation. This bill is an example of the efforts by the Congress to support our many Sea Grant College programs in improving marine resource conservation and management.

H.R. 5618 implements changes in the Sea Grant Program, which is administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, that were recommended by the National Research Council in their 2006 report that has strong support from the various agencies and the Sea Grant Association. Such recommendations include increasing the interaction between the National Sea Grant and the individual state programs. It will improve programmatic performance reviews that will strengthen oversight and accountability but at the same time will ensure that Sea Grant programs are consistent and supportive of the national objectives. Importantly, the increase in funding levels will greatly assist in the needs of our coastal and Great Lake communities and will improve program activities and research that have been at a standstill because of flat-funding for the past few years.

Like our national land grant programs, the National Sea Grant College Program is a powerful resource in maintaining America's status in the world for research and development of our marine sciences. It is a program that we must continue to strengthen and support.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will authorize funding for the National Sea Grant Program until FY 2014. The inclusion of the many recommendations by the NRC in the language of the bill and the strong support of the Federal agencies and the Sea Grant Association reinforce the necessity to pass this legislation immediately. Given that almost 54 percent of our population lives on the coast, the U.S. has

continued to provide so little for marine policy research. Through H.R. 5618, I am hopeful that we are able to increase this necessary funding to monitor the drastic changes that are greatly affecting our coastlines.

I am grateful for the work that Sea Grant has been able to provide through research and projects to my Congressional district. Through the University of Hawaii, Sea Grant has a strong presence at the American Samoa Community College and has continued to educate students of the necessity in protecting our reefs and marine environments. They have also continued to provide the tools for marine research that is urgently needed by the U.S. territories.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 5618. Again, I thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5618 the National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2008 authored by my friend and chairwoman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, Representative Madeleine Bordallo.

The National Sea Grant College Program has, since 1966, provided research grants, traineeships and fellowships which help graduate students and researchers study areas of the ocean which have strong effects on people. This is mostly done through the State Sea Grant programs which operate in most coastal States in conjunction with major universities. The Sea Grant programs provide valuable research and education into the economics, public health, and environmental impacts where people connect with the oceans. I have trouble thinking of a better return to the public on our research investments.

The National Sea Grant program operates the Dean John A. Knauss National Marine Policy Fellowship which provides graduate students in ocean science and environmental studies the opportunity to bring their expertise as a fellow in a Congressional office or in a Federal agency office to gain experience and impact ocean policy. In my tenure in Congress, I have had 11 Sea Grant Fellows in my office. They have provided invaluable knowledge and passion for the oceans that have improved my understanding and helped to bolster my fight for the oceans.

In California, we are lucky to have two Sea Grant Programs: the California Sea Grant program operated through the world class University of California system and the Southern California Sea Grant program operated through the University of Southern California. These programs are on the ground in California connecting the research and policy community, providing research grants, and educating the public, scientists, and policy makers on the importance of human interactions with the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, the National Sea Grant programs have done a lot with a little money and I am confident that they will continue this tradition. I cannot emphasize enough the need for this Congress to provide for ocean stewardship now. The oceans and the Great Lakes belong to all the people of the United States and it is our duty to understand the implications of our actions on them. I support the National Sea Grant College Program Amendment Act and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5618, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1714) to clarify the boundaries of Coastal Barrier Resources System Clam Pass Unit FL-64P.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map subtitled “FL-64P”, relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System unit designated as Coastal Barrier Resources System Clam Pass Unit FL-64P, that is included in the set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System” and referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), is hereby replaced by another map relating to that unit entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System Clam Pass Unit, FL-64P” and dated July 21, 2005.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1714 is noncontroversial legislation that would replace the Coastal Barrier Resources System map designated as Clam Pass Unit FL-64P to correct legitimate inaccuracies. This legislation is identical to noncontroversial legislation reported by the Committee on Resources during the 109th Congress.

The new map, dated July 21, 2005, that would be adopted by passage of this legislation, would remove approximately 48 acres of private land from the otherwise protected area, or the

OPA, that was established in 1990 to include the Clam Pass Conservation Area. Private land owners indicated that these lands were never held within the conservation area, and were erroneously included in the OPA. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, after completing an exhaustive investigation, agreed that these areas, in fact, were added in error.

□ 1415

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service fully supports this technical correction legislation which will also add approximately 68 acres of undeveloped land to the OPA that were previously omitted. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the new map that would be adopted also has been certified as accurate by all local authorities.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support passage of this noncontroversial bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1714, introduced by Congressman CONNIE MACK of Florida, corrects an honest mapping mistake made in the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990. Under current law, only Congress can add or delete property from the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Under this bill, 48 acres of previously held land would be removed from the system, which would allow the affected homeowners to qualify for Federal flood insurance. We would be making this change because this property is not contained within the designated Clam Pass Conservation Area, these are not inholdings, and these lands were never held for conservation or recreation purposes.

We would be providing this relief because this bill satisfies the threshold of being a legitimate mapping mistake. The Fish and Wildlife Service testified in support of this technical correction, and the new implementing map would add 65 acres of conservation land to the Coastal Barrier Resources System that was overlooked when the unit was originally created. As a result, the net effect of H.R. 1714 is to actually increase the size of the system by 17 acres.

I would urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 1714.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this legislation. Again, I want to thank my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for supporting this noncontroversial piece of legislation, and I urge Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1714.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISH STOCKING IN NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE COMPLEX LAKES

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3227) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3227

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to authorize the National Park Service to allow the stocking of fish in certain lakes under certain conditions in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

SEC. 2. STOCKING OF CERTAIN LAKES IN NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK, ROSS LAKE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, AND LAKE CHELAN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, may authorize the stocking of fish in lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

(b) *CONDITIONS.*—The following conditions shall apply to stocking of lakes under subsection (a):

(1) *The Secretary is authorized to allow stocking in up to, but not to exceed, 42 lakes. The 42 lakes which may be stocked are those lakes identified for potential stocking under Alternative B of the 2005 North Cascades National Park Service Complex Mountain Lakes Fishery Management Plan Draft.*

(2) *The Secretary shall only stock fish that are—*

(A) *native to the slope of the Cascade Range on which the lake to be stocked is located; and*

(B) *functionally sterile.*

(3) *The Secretary is authorized to coordinate the stocking of fish with the State of Washington.*

(c) *REPORTS.*—The Secretary shall continue a program of research and monitoring of the impacts of fish stocking on park resources and shall report the results of such research and monitoring to the appropriate committees of Congress every 5 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3227 authorizes the National Park Serv-

ice to stock fish in the North Cascades National Park, the Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area. These lakes do not naturally contain fish, but fish stocking has been conducted in these lakes periodically since the late 1800s.

The North Cascades National Park is currently working on the Mountain Lake Fisheries Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement that evaluates fish stocking in the park. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement found that fish stocking could only take place in these lakes if the National Park Service was granted the authority to do so by Congress. During committee consideration of H.R. 3227, changes were made to the bill to incorporate suggestions from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to H.R. 3227.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman DOC HASTINGS of Washington State and the cosponsors of this bill should be congratulated for their efforts to ensure continuation of a long-standing and highly successful program that creates fishing opportunities in the North Cascades region.

For over 100 years, 91 of the 245 lakes in the North Cascades Complex have been stocked with fish. This has created recreational opportunities that are important to the quality of life and the region and help sustain the local economy.

I urge support for the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this legislation. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his cooperation in managing these three bills this afternoon on the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3227, legislation to allow for the continued stocking of fish in certain alpine lakes in the North Cascades National Park Complex, including the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

Many of these lakes have been stocked since the turn of the 20th century, long before they became part of the National Park complex. For decades, volunteer groups, working with the State of Washington, have stocked trout in a number of lakes in this area under carefully constructed management plans written by State and Park Service biologists. In addition, congressional consideration of the creation of the North Cascades National Park points to allowing fish stocking.

In order to protect this longstanding practice in the North Cascades, I introduced H.R. 3227 to ensure that fish stocking can continue. While I believe the original text of this bill provided the clearest path to the protection and continuation of fish stocking, I am also confident that this amended text also fully ensures the stocking of fish in these lakes.

I would like to briefly mention two of the changes to the legislation. First, the amended version of H.R. 3227 reduces the number of lakes that can be studied from 91, which is the number of lakes that have historically had fish stocking, to 42. I believe this reduction was unnecessary but am supporting it to ensure the advancement of this legislation. In my view, it should be left up to scientists in the Park Service and the State of Washington to decide which lakes should be stocked. Congress does not have the proper science to study which lakes are best and, therefore, we should not be arbitrarily limiting the number of lakes that can be studied.

The changes made in the Resources Committee also limited the type of fish that can be used to stock the lakes. After working with the National Park Service and the State of Washington, my original legislation was drafted to allow fish that are either native to the watershed or functionally sterile to be used. The version before us today states that the fish have to be both native to the Cascade Range and functionally sterile. The one word change from "or" to "and" puts a needless burden on those who stock the lakes. Those involved with fish stocking want to ensure that the lakes and the surrounding area are kept in pristine condition. In addition, the National Park Service and the State of Washington are the only entities with the authority to stock the lakes. Again, it is my view that these decisions should be left up to science and the people working in the North Cascades to decide what fish are both safe for the environment and the best for stocking. This change will only serve to increase the cost and the effort needed to stock the lakes of the North Cascades—but such a compromise moves this bill forward.

Despite my disagreement on the wisdom of changes made to this legislation, I am pleased that the House has the opportunity to pass H.R. 3227 today. Although the version before us is far from perfect, it does allow fish stocking to rightfully continue in the North Cascades. Compromise is never easy, and at times it produces a diminished product. That is the case today. However, I can support it as a result of bipartisan negotiations and agreement. But, more importantly, I can support it because it provides firm protections to continue fish stocking where it was always intended to be allowed.

Finally, I would like to thank many of my Washington state colleagues who cosponsored H.R. 3227, including RICK LARSEN, NORM DICKS, and CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, BRIAN BAIRD and ADAM SMITH. I especially would like to note the assistance provided by NORM DICKS, whose involvement in this issue goes back to his time as a staff member in Congress. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation to make sure that my constituents and many other residents of Washington and our surrounding States can continue to enjoy the recreation opportunities created by fish stocking in the North Cascades.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3227, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE COWBOY

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 984) expressing support for the designation of July 26, 2008 as "National Day of the Cowboy".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 984

Whereas pioneering men and women, known as cowboys, helped establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliation;

Whereas the cowboy is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures;

Whereas the cowboy lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been part of the American culture for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy, through the work of approximately 727,000 ranchers in all 50 States, and contributes to the well-being of nearly every county in the Nation;

Whereas annual attendance at professional and working ranch rodeo events exceeds 27,000,000 fans, and the rodeo is the 7th most watched sport in the Nation;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of the cowboy spans race, gender, and generations;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music, and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an American icon; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses support for the designation of a "National Day of the Cowboy"; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to join my colleagues in the consideration of H. Res. 984 which supports the designation of July 26, 2008, as National Day of the Cowboy.

H. Res. 984 was introduced by Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS of Arizona on February 13, 2008, and since then, the bill has garnered the support and cosponsorship of 52 Members of Congress, both men and women, from both sides of the aisle. The measure was considered and passed by voice vote out of the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2008.

Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable to assert that our great country wouldn't be what it is today without the significant influences of the cowboy. This is why each year a day is set aside for Americans to celebrate the contributions of the cowboy and cowgirl to our Nation's culture and heritage. With the advocacy of the National Day of the Cowboy Organization for the past several years, the National Day of the Cowboy has been celebrated by the public through education, the arts, special events, rodeos, and other community activities.

This year, July 26 has been selected as the day for honoring and preserving the rich history of the cowboy settlement in the American West, an act that forever changed the landscape of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for introducing this thoughtful measure, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating the American cowboys and cowgirls by agreeing to pass H. Res. 984.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the resolution designating July 26, 2008, as the National Day of the Cowboy.

For the last 3 years on the last Saturday of July, people across America gathered to honor one of the greatest icons of our Nation, the American cowboy. National Day of the Cowboy first emerged in July of 2005 in large part to the efforts of the late United States Senator Craig Thomas of Wyoming.

Cowboys are the original heroes of American culture. From the earliest western settlers to present-day ranchers and cattlemen, their tireless courage, integrity, and adventurous spirit has made them a symbol of values that built this great Nation.

Their trade nourishes our bodies as well as our souls. The values inspire each of us. From Maine to California, from twisted urban streets to the vast, open plains, Americans envy and respect those who each day, ride off into the sunset.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution and leave you with the words of poet laureate Ron Wilson—

We give thanks for all that cowboys and cowgirls do,

To keep the Cowboy way alive and true.

So we honor this legacy for the value it will employ,

As we celebrate the National Day of the American Cowboy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I thank my colleague from South Carolina for supporting this resolution.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that today the House is considering H. Res. 984, a resolution I sponsored that officially designates July 26, 2008, as the "National Day of the Cowboy."

Located in beautiful Willcox, Arizona, the National Day of the Cowboy organization works to increase national support for the proclaimed "Cowboy Day," and to publicize news and information about the resolution and campaign, so that active participation in celebration of the National Day of the Cowboy continues to grow each year.

Many thanks to Bethany Braley, executive director and publisher of the National Day of the Cowboy organization, for her tireless vision to remind future generations of the cowboys' contribution to America's rich western heritage.

While the U.S. Senate has recognized the National Day of the Cowboy in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008, H. Res. 984 represents the first time that the U.S. House of Representatives has officially recognized the contribution of the cowboy and cowgirl to America's culture and heritage. I am pleased to be a part of the 4th Annual National Day of the Cowboy designation. On June 20, 2008, the National Day of the Cowboy resolution also passed in the Arizona State Legislature, making Arizona the first State to pass the resolution.

Our legendary cowboy and cowgirl are embraced and respected by people the world over as symbols of rugged individualism. Each represents a commitment to explore, work hard and seek adventure while demonstrating the personal determination to survive. He/she is loyal to an honorable code of ethics as well as persistent and tenacious in the face of any challenge.

In honor of cowboys and cowgirls worldwide, I encourage Americans to observe the National Day of the Cowboy on Saturday, July 26, 2008, with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 984.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BISHOP RALPH E. BROWER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5506) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service lo-

cated at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Bishop Ralph E. Brower Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5506

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BISHOP RALPH E. BROWER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Bishop Ralph E. Brower Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Bishop Ralph E. Brower Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a Member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 5506 which names the postal facility in Jersey City, New Jersey, after Bishop Ralph E. Brower. H.R. 5506, which was introduced by Representative ALBIO SIREs of New Jersey on February 27, 2008, was reported from the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2008, by voice vote.

This measure has the support of the entire New Jersey delegation and provides this body a chance to recognize the contributions and accomplishments of a distinguished and highly respected gentleman from the Garden State of New Jersey, the admirable Bishop Ralph E. Brower.

□ 1430

Unfortunately, Representative SIREs is unable to join us on the floor today, but nonetheless, he asked that his statement of support be submitted for the RECORD.

Born into humble beginnings in North Carolina as the eldest of six children, Bishop Brower's educational aspirations led him to attend Laurinburg Institute and Kettle College of North Carolina. He received his master's degree from Kings College in Briarcliff Manor, New York, his master's in divinity from Florida State University, and his Ph.D. from Grambling State University.

Bishop Brower began to make his mark on New Jersey and the commu-

nity of Jersey City in the early 1950s when he took the helm of St. Michael's Methodist Church. Over the years, he has overseen the growth of the congregation from six members to the thousands that now worship at St. Michael's.

Largely responsible for helping the church and its congregation blossom into a positive force for change in the community, Bishop Ralph E. Brower undoubtedly deserves the honor of having a United States postal facility named after him.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in support of this measure by voting in favor of H.R. 5506.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5506, a resolution to designate the post office located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Bishop Ralph E. Brower Post Office Building."

Bishop Ralph E. Brower, a Methodist pastor and native of North Carolina, has been a vital presence in the religious and civic communities of northern New Jersey for over five decades.

A community leader and accomplished intellectual, Bishop Brower is, above all, a devoted family man. Married to his loving wife, Alberta, for over 60 years, the bishop has been the guiding force in the lives of his three wonderful children and 18 grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

His dedication to his denomination and community is exemplary, and it is fitting to name the post office in Jersey City, New Jersey, in his honor.

Generous and compassionate, Bishop Brower's passion for religious and civic duties is fueled by a personal commitment to intellectual development. After receiving his B.A. from Kettle College, he went on to earn an M.A. from Kings College, and finally a Ph.D. from Grambling State University.

Academic accolades only scratch the surface of a man who has devoted so much of his life to improving the lives of the people surrounding him. He served in numerous positions including as the Commissioner for the Jersey City Redevelopment Agency and 4 years as the Deputy Mayor of Jersey City. His service demonstrates that he truly is a man of the people. This devotion has not gone unnoticed. Over the years, the Bishop has received a number of accolades for his civic devotion by organizations such as the New Jersey Urban League and NAACP.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5506 which would designate the U.S. Postal Service building located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey as the "Bishop Ralph E. Brower Post Office Building."

Bishop Ralph E. Brower has dedicated more than 50 years of his life in service to the community of Jersey City, New Jersey. In 1954, he was called to build the St. Michael Methodist Church. He started the church with only six members, and served their parish as pastor for over 54 years.

In addition to his role as pastor, Bishop Brower served the Jersey City community in

many ways. His professional and ministerial accomplishments also include being president of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance for 25 years; Hudson County Chaplain for 25 years; commissioner for the Jersey City Redevelopment for 5 years; and deputy mayor for 4 years.

With his lifetime of dedication to public service and ministry, Bishop Ralph E. Brower consistently illustrates his caring and commitment to the Jersey City community.

I am thrilled to celebrate this dedicated community leader through this legislation. I cannot think of better way to honor Bishop Brower's work then to designate a U.S. Postal Office in his name.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5506.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNIE COX POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4010) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 West Percy Street in Indianola, Mississippi, as the "Minnie Cox Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4010

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MINNIE COX POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 West Percy Street in Indianola, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the "Minnie Cox Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Minnie Cox Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from Mississippi, in the consideration of H.R. 4010 which names a postal facility in Indianola, Mississippi, after the first black postmistress in the United States of America, Ms. Minnie Geddings Cox.

Introduced on October 30, 2007, by Congressman Bennie Thompson, the Representative of Mississippi's Second Congressional District, H.R. 4010 is co-sponsored by the State's entire delegation. Congressman THOMPSON's measure, H.R. 4010, was reported from the Oversight Committee on June 12, 2008, by voice vote.

This afternoon's postal naming bill honoring our country's first black female postmaster is designed to pay tribute to Minnie M. Cox, who served as the postmaster of Indianola, Mississippi, during the administrations of Presidents Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt.

As we can see, Mississippi has a long, glorious history, and Ms. Cox is indeed a part of it. Ms. Cox's legacy stands as a beacon for all Americans to admire and emulate, in tribute to all that she accomplished by breaking barriers and providing quality service to her hometown of Indianola, Mississippi.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us pass H.R. 4010 and designate the postal office building located at 100 West Percy Street in Indianola, Mississippi, as the "Minnie Cox Post Office Building."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4010, legislation to designate the post office at Indianola, Mississippi, as the "Minnie Cox Post Office Building."

Minnie M. Geddings Cox was born in 1869 in a Mississippi emerging from the Civil War. After graduating from Fisk University, she returned to teach in the common schools in her hometown of Lexington.

In 1891 at the age of 22, Ms. Cox was appointed postmistress of Indianola by President Benjamin Harrison, becoming the first black postmistress of the United States. She was reappointed by President William McKinley and, again, by President Theodore Roosevelt.

In 1902, however, some of the local whites of Indianola demanded Ms. Cox's resignation, determined to remove her from her leadership position solely because of her race.

Ms. Cox refused, but when threats against her and her family persisted, she submitted her resignation to be effective in January 1903. Theodore Roosevelt felt that Ms. Cox had been aggrieved and refused to accept her resignation. Instead, he closed the post of-

fice in Indianola, rerouted the mail, and continued paying Ms. Cox.

It is important to remember determined and dedicated Americans such as Minnie Cox and be ready to stand for what is right when people are treated unjustly.

Let us now commemorate this courageous woman by naming the post office building in Indianola in honor of Minnie Cox.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4010, legislation designating the United States Post Office located at 100 W. Percy Street in Indianola, Mississippi as the "Minnie Cox United States Post Office".

Minnie M. Geddings Cox was one of two daughters born to William and Mary Geddings of Lexington, Mississippi. She graduated from Fisk University and first taught school at the common schools in Lexington. Soon after, she married and assisted her husband, Wayne, when he was principal of the Indianola Colored Public School.

Minnie M. Geddings Cox, was appointed postmistress of Indianola, Mississippi in 1891, by President Benjamin Harrison, and was reappointed by President William McKinley; thereby, becoming the first Black postmistress of the United States. On January 25, 1900, President McKinley raised the rank of the Indianola Post Office from fourth class to third class and appointed Mrs. Cox for a full 4-year term.

However, in the fall of 1902, under the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, a controversy brought national attention to Mrs. Cox. James K. Vardaman, running for governor, in 1902 used Minnie Cox as proof that African Americans had too much power, and that President Theodore Roosevelt was a Negrophile. Vardaman, who was indeed elected governor, called Theodore Roosevelt that "coon-flavored miscegenationist in the White House."

Jim Crow Laws overran Reconstruction in America and whites wanted blacks eliminated from leadership positions. Mrs. Cox was threatened with violence by local whites, who held several mass or mob meetings to demand her removal (her term expired in 1904). The mayor and sheriff declined to protect her, and as a result of the increased tension and threats of physical harm, she resigned as postmaster, effective January 1, 1903, and left town for a time.

President Roosevelt believed Mrs. Cox had been wronged, and that the authority of the federal government was being compromised and refused to accept her resignation. Instead, he closed Indianola's post office on January 2, 1903, rerouted the mail to Greenville, MS, thirty miles away and Minnie Cox continued to receive her salary. For four hours in January 1903, the Indianola postal event was debated on the floor of the United States Senate, and appeared on the front pages of newspapers across the country. One year later, at the expiration of Mrs. Cox's term, in February 1904, the post office was reopened, but demoted in rank from third class to fourth class.

Minnie Cox and her husband Wayne W. Cox, who had been an employee in the railway mail service, returned to Indianola and organized the "Delta Penny Savings Bank." They had been substantial property owners before 1903, and they bought more land and became successful bankers as well. Much of

the success of African-Americans is attributed to Wayne and Minnie Cox. Both descendants of parents who were former slaves, through their ability to penetrate barriers, promote progress, and instill pride as educators, bankers, entrepreneurs, real estate investors, and political activists, exemplify remarkable courage, wisdom and tenacity.

United in matrimony October 31, 1889, Wayne and Minnie Cox had one daughter, Ethel Grant Cox. The Coxes acquired thousands of acres of land and ranked among the wealthiest of the race in Mississippi. Their spacious home sat on some five acres of land in the white section of town. As premier supporters of the business enterprises of blacks in the state, they sold homes to hundreds of African Americans on terms that would not have been possible if they were dealing with people who had no interest in them.

Today, a street in Indianola named in their honor, Cox Street, bears their name. Also, the city's most popular park, Cox Park, located within minutes of the business district at Faison Avenue and West Gresham Street in Indianola, is named in their honor. Minnie Cox died in 1933.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to in strong support of this resolution and urge Congress to pass this legislation renaming the Post Office in Indianola, MS, after the first African-American postmistress, Mrs. Minnie Cox.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of this resolution and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4010.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CROSSING OF THE NORTH POLE BY THE USS "NAUTILUS"

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1067) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the crossing of the North Pole by the USS *Nautilus* (SSN 571) and its significance in the history of both our Nation and the world.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1067

Whereas the USS *Nautilus* (SSN 571), built and launched at Electric Boat in Groton, Connecticut, on January 21, 1954, was the first vessel in the world to be powered by nuclear power;

Whereas the USS *Nautilus* overcame extreme difficulties of navigation and maneuverability while submerged under the polar ice, and became the first vessel to cross the geographic North Pole on August 3, 1958;

Whereas the USS *Nautilus* continued on her voyage and became the first vessel to suc-

cessfully navigate a course across the top of the world;

Whereas the USS *Nautilus*, having claimed this historic milestone and returned home to Naval Submarine Base New London, continued to establish a series of naval records in her distinguished 25-year career, including being the first submarine to journey "20,000 leagues under the sea";

Whereas the USS *Nautilus* completed these significant and laudable achievements during a critical phase of the Cold War, providing a source of inspiration for Americans and raising the hopes of the Free World;

Whereas the USS *Nautilus* was the first naval vessel in peacetime to receive the Presidential Unit Citation for its meritorious efforts in crossing the North Pole;

Whereas Commander William R. Anderson of the United States Navy was awarded the Legion of Merit for his role in commanding the USS *Nautilus* during its historic voyage;

Whereas the USS *Nautilus* and its contribution to world history was praised by a range of American Presidents, including President Harry Truman, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, President Lyndon B. Johnson, President Jimmy Carter, and President Bill Clinton; and

Whereas President Eisenhower described the voyage to the North Pole as a "magnificent achievement" from which "the entire free world would benefit": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the journey to the North Pole undertaken by the USS *Nautilus*;

(2) commends the officers and crew of the USS *Nautilus* on the 50th anniversary of their magnificent achievement;

(3) recognizes the importance of the USS *Nautilus*' journey to the North Pole as not only a military and scientific accomplishment, but also in confirming America's longstanding interest in this vital region of the world;

(4) commends the role of the USS *Nautilus* and the United States Submarine Force in protecting the interests of the free world during the Cold War; and

(5) supports the continuing role of the United States Submarine Force in defending our Nation in the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of House Resolution 1067, I rise today in strong support, which honors an important anniversary not only to my district but to our Navy and our country.

In June 1958, the USS *Nautilus* (SSN 571), the world's first nuclear-powered submarine, departed Seattle, Oregon, as part of a top secret operation called Operation Sunshine. Unknown to many

at the time, the *Nautilus* was embarking on a historic mission that took it on a course north to the arctic ice cap. At 11:15 p.m. on August 3, 1958, the boat became the first vessel to cross the geographic North Pole when Commander William Anderson, *Nautilus*' commanding officer, announced to his crew: "For the world, our country, and the Navy—the North Pole."

This historic crossing of 90 North took place at a critical time in our Nation's history: the Cold War was heating up; the Soviet Union had seemingly laid claim to space with the launch of Sputnik; and many Americans and many around the world were looking for something to rally around, a sign that we were not ceding big ideas and notable achievements to others. *Nautilus*' sonar man, Al Charette, one of my constituents, described their journey as an effort to out-Sputnik the Russians and they did it.

Few on board the *Nautilus* realized the scope of their achievement. They were simply sailors doing their job and doing it well. However, on reaching the North Pole, the *Nautilus* clearly demonstrated our undersea superiority and opened the region to decades of scientific research and exploration.

The crossing of the North Pole was praised by numerous world leaders at the time, being described by President Eisenhower as a magnificent achievement from which the entire free world would benefit. A ticker tape parade was held in honor of the crew in New York City. The *Nautilus* became the first naval vessel in peacetime to receive the Presidential Unit Citation for its meritorious efforts in crossing the North Pole, and Commander William R. Anderson was awarded the Legion of Merit.

In the 50 years since, the United States Navy and Coast Guard have repeatedly followed in the footsteps of this historic voyage. Dozens of U.S. submarines, in addition to specially fitted vessels and general aircraft of the United States Coast Guard, have journeyed to the top of the world in service to their country and to reinforce our Arctic presence. These submarines and their intrepid crews have broken through the surface, charted new courses, and expanded our knowledge of the Arctic.

I myself have had the unique opportunity to see this work firsthand when I traveled aboard the USS *Alexandria*, a Groton-based submarine, to observe the 2007 Ice Exercises in the Arctic Circle. While the technology and capabilities of our submarines has changed in the 50 years since the *Nautilus*' journey, the unmatched skill, the dedication and the talent of our submariners continues to allow our Nation to retain an important presence in this critical part of the world.

I just want to add, Mr. Speaker, having the opportunity again to be on-board a submarine under the ice just reinforces to me anyway the incredible accomplishment of the *Nautilus*. At

the time, scientific opinion believed that it was physically impossible for a submarine to pass under the North Pole because of blockages by the ice and the shifting movements of the ice under the North Pole. This was a vessel which was completely and utterly alone at the time. If there was any accident, if there was any problem, basically they were completely on their own and had no means of any type of rescue or support.

Built and launched at Electric Boat in Groton, Connecticut, on January 21, 1954, the *Nautilus* was the first vessel in the world to be powered by nuclear power. After claiming their historic milestone at 90 North and returning home to Naval Base New London, the *Nautilus* continued to establish a series of naval records in her distinguished 25-year career, including being the first submarine to journey 20,000 leagues under the sea.

The history and legacy of the *Nautilus* is not the only meaningful story to my congressional district but to the entire submarine force and to our Nation. Today, the *Nautilus* proudly serves as a museum where visitors from around the world come to learn about both her history-making service to our country and the role of the submarine force in securing our Nation. The *Nautilus* truly helped set the tone as the standard bearer for the submarine force, and achievements like the crossing of 90 North both proved the capabilities of our Nation at a critical time in our history and raised the bar for all who came after her.

Too often the critical achievements of our submarine force, our silent service, go unnoticed. The resolution today rightfully honors not only the officers and crew of the *Nautilus* but all those who played a part in her success, from the highest levels of our government, to the countless support ships and personnel who helped her along the way, and finally, the talented workforce at Electric Boat who gave us the first and finest submarine in our history.

I would like to enter two articles from the New London Day into the RECORD, one highlighting the opening of the new exhibit at the Submarine Force Museum in Groton and an editorial praising the achievements of the *Nautilus* and her crew.

□ 1445

I will also enter into the RECORD at a later date a list of the crew who journeyed to 90 North so that their names will be tied to the historic achievements in today's resolution.

I want to thank the Commander of the naval submarine base in New London, Captain Mark Ginda, who first planted the idea for this resolution in my staff's mind. And in addition, since I introduced H. Res. 1067, my office has received nearly 50 e-mails from individuals all across the country who served or whose loved ones served aboard the *Nautilus*' journey to 90 North. I want to thank them for their comments and

their strong support. In particular, I want to thank Captain Anderson's widow, who I met at the Farragut Square anniversary service for the submarine force earlier this year, who was just an incredibly gracious, wonderful person who has done everything that she can to make sure that the memory of this incredible achievement is brought forth to young people all across the country and is a strong supporter of our Navy.

And most especially, I want to recognize the veterans of the *Nautilus*' journey to 90 North that I am privileged to represent here in Congress. We are all proud of them and the legacy they have established for our submarine force and our Nation.

H. Res. 1067 is a much-deserved recognition of the important role the submarine force plays in the security of our Nation, and I urge its passage.

[From the New London Day, June 30, 2008]

50 YEARS LATER, "NAUTILUS" CREW STILL FEELS IT COULD REPEAT POLAR FEAT

(By Jennifer Grogan)

GROTON.—Former USS *Nautilus* crew members say it does not seem like 50 years have passed since they made their historic crossing of the North Pole under the ice cap, and that if the Navy would kindly give them another nuclear power plant, they could man their ship and head back out to sea.

"When you first join the Navy and look forward to 20 years and retirement, you say, 'That's forever.' I put 28 in and it seems like it all happened just yesterday," said Al Charette, a sonarman on board for the North Pole trip. "Every time we have a reunion, the crew thinks we should go out and get that ship underway. We're ready. We're still a crew."

"We remember each little feature of rigging it for dive. We feel very confident we could do that again," said Jack Kurrus, an engineman also on the trip. "Wouldn't it be nice to go to sea one more time?"

Nautilus (SSN 571) left Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on July 23, 1958, under top-secret orders to conduct Operation Sunshine, the first crossing of the North Pole by a ship. About 10 months earlier, the Soviet Union had launched the first artificial satellite into space.

"We wanted to out-Sputnik the Russians," Charette said.

The crew of 116 men reached the North Pole at 11:15 p.m. on Aug. 3, 1958. They received the Presidential Unit Citation, the first ever issued in peacetime.

Charette, Kurrus and another former crew member, Joe Degnan, were at the U.S. Navy Submarine Force Museum Friday for the unveiling of a new exhibit that commemorates the 50th anniversary of their voyage. The exhibit, which includes artifacts and previously unpublished color images, runs through March 2009.

The successful 1958 trip was not the *Nautilus*' first attempt to cross from the Pacific to the Atlantic over the top of the world.

The crew was in the Arctic a year earlier to see how the submarine would operate under the ice. When the ship lost power to its gyrocompasses, Cmdr. William R. Anderson gave the order to turn back because there was no way to fix the ship's position.

"We spent 72 hours trying to find our way out and that was really, really scary," Kurrus said.

Nautilus visited the Pacific in 1958, under the cover of teaching those in the Pacific Fleet about nuclear submarines. The sub-

marine headed to the North Pole but encountered heavy ice and shallow water on the way. At one point, the 320-foot submarine had just a few feet of water over its sail and about 20 feet below the keel.

The crew returned to Pearl Harbor and waited a month for the ice to break up and melt before making another attempt to go to Portland, England, by way of the North Pole.

Kenneth Carr, who was then a lieutenant and later retired as a vice admiral, said it was "pretty routine on board" as they neared 90 degrees North on Aug. 3, 1958.

Carr said he asked the scientist on the trip, "how will we know we crossed the pole?" Dr. Waldo K. Lyon pointed to a machine with a green dot going around in a circle.

"He said the dot would stop and go in the other direction, and it did," Carr said. "It wasn't anything dramatic."

Once the *Nautilus* surfaced, Anderson sent a message to the Navy—"Nautilus 90 North."

"I'm not sure we really appreciated the depth of what had just happened, and I think it was a long time before any of us realized it," Charette said. "All we knew was when we ended up in England, everyone and their brother wanted an autograph."

Those on board nicknamed themselves PANOPUS, an acronym from the phrase from the Pacific to the Atlantic via the North Pole. A "Welcome Home PANOPUS" banner is one of the artifacts on display in the new exhibit. Sarah Martin, who works at the Naval Submarine Base, was the graphic designer for the exhibit.

Several events are planned at the museum leading up to the anniversary, including a book signing and lecture by Alfred McLaren about the USS *Queenfish* on July 12 and by Don Keith about the *Nautilus* on Aug. 2, and a ceremony on the *Nautilus* Aug. 3.

The *Nautilus* Alumni Association is planning a reunion Sept. 25-28 at the Groton Inn and Suites.

[From the New London Day, July 9, 2008]

WONDER OF "NAUTILUS"

Even after 50 years, the feat of the men and their boat, USS *Nautilus*, is astounding. Crossing the North Pole under the polar ice cap in a nuclear-powered submarine constituted much more than the single event itself. The voyage unlocked the tremendous potential of submersibles powered in a way that they could travel indefinitely on a mission. And imaginations soared.

There has followed one generation after another of nuclear submarines, each more capable than its predecessors, but the pioneering brilliance of *Nautilus* remains a marker for naval historians. So, too, does the relentless pursuit of excellence that characterized Adm. Hyman G. Rickover's direction of the Navy's nuclear power program.

As reporter Jennifer Grogan's feature story June 30 revealed, the voyage also created an impenetrable bond among the crew and officers of *Nautilus*. At the time of the trip, few in civilian life quite understood the magnitude of the *Nautilus*' accomplishment. But succeeding classes of submarines have made clear the almost limitless capabilities of these boats.

The self-confidence and optimism displayed by the veterans in Ms. Grogan's story is a modern expression of the morale of the crew that ventured north in 1958. Those men and the imagination that conceptualized their voyage are a credit to the Navy's versatility and technical skills.

That is why it is especially fitting that the *Nautilus*, open to the public, resides here next to the Submarine Base, an interesting naval laboratory for all to see. If you haven't yet taken the time to pay a visit, we urge you to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1067, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the crossing of the North Pole by the USS *Nautilus* and its significance in the history of both our Nation and the world.

I want to commend my colleague on the House Armed Services Committee, Representative JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut, for sponsoring this important resolution, as well as the 20 other cosponsors, including Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT, the ranking member of the Seapower and Expeditionary Forces Subcommittee.

Submarines have been a central component of our Nation's naval forces for over a century. Congress authorized the construction of the *Nautilus* in July 1951. After merely 26 months of construction, unheard of by today's standards, the first nuclear-powered submarine—indeed, the first nuclear-powered vessel in the world—was commissioned into the United States Navy. Shortly thereafter, on the morning of January 17, 1955, *Nautilus*' first Commanding Officer, Commander Eugene P. Wilkinson, ordered the boat away from the pier and signaled the historic message, "Underway on Nuclear Power." From that day forward, *Nautilus* continued to break all submerged speed and distance records. This included the historic mission to the North Pole on August 3, 1958.

In honoring the USS *Nautilus*, I note that now, just as 50 years ago, both quality and quantity matter with respect to our naval fleet. Although our current military conflicts have caused us to rightly focus on the health of our ground forces, it is again time for the Nation to have a strategic outlook on the future role of our naval forces. We should do our level best to maintain our maritime dominance and forward presence around the globe.

I will conclude by noting that the USS *Nautilus*' journey from the North Pole is historically significant and a magnificent scientific and military achievement. I am proud that the United States Navy has set an international standard of excellence.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call upon all Americans to pause and honor the service and sacrifice of not only those brave Americans who crossed the North Pole 50 years ago, but all those who have served and continue to serve in the defense of our Nation and its values.

I urge my colleagues to support this most worthy resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his strong support for this measure, and just for the record indicate that on August 3 the *Nautilus* Museum will be holding a formal event to celebrate the 50th an-

niversary of this, again, incredible scientific and historic achievement by the U.S. Navy. Again, I just want to salute the efforts of all those people involved and urge passage of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1067.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF THE 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1080) honoring the extraordinary service and exceptional sacrifice of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), known as the Screaming Eagles, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1080

Whereas the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), or the Screaming Eagles, headquartered in Fort Campbell, Kentucky, has faithfully answered America's call for service since its formation on August 15, 1942;

Whereas the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) defense of Bastogne during World War II is regarded as one of the great achievements in United States military history;

Whereas the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) is the only air assault division in the world;

Whereas the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) has since deployed tens of thousands of young men and women to Iraq and Afghanistan no less than three times in support of the Global War on Terrorism, performing counter-insurgency operations, securing liberty for such nations to deny safe haven to terrorists, and helping build a better future for such nations;

Whereas over 6,000 Screaming Eagles have made the ultimate sacrifice and countless others have been injured in multiple operations since inception; and

Whereas the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) has recognized its "rendezvous with destiny," serving the Nation in five wars, with 19 of its members having been awarded the Medal of Honor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), also known as the Screaming Eagles, as one of the great Divisions in American military history;

(2) recognizes that America owes a tremendous debt to the 101st Airborne Division (Air

Assault) for the extraordinary service, sacrifice, and patriotism of the soldiers of the Division and their families; and

(3) acknowledges that the contributions of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) to ensure the continued safety and security of this nation will not go unnoticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1080, honoring the extraordinary service and exceptional sacrifice of the 101st Airborne Division, more commonly known as the Screaming Eagles.

On August 16, 1942, the day the 101st Airborne Division was activated, Major General William C. Lee observed that "The 101st has no history, but it has a rendezvous with destiny." Since that day over 60 years ago, the 101st Airborne Division has distinguished itself time and again.

Currently headquartered at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, the 101st Airborne Division has faithfully answered America's call to service and has a distinguished history as the only air assault division in the world. The division cleared the way for the 1st and 4th Infantry Divisions at Omaha and Utah Beach on D-day in Normandy.

One of the most notable of the Screaming Eagles' achievements was the defense of Bastogne, Belgium during the Battle of the Bulge, where the division was surrounded by advancing enemy forces who demanded their immediate surrender. Brigadier General Anthony McAuliffe led the 101st through the siege, which was broken on December 26, 1944.

The division again proved its laudable skill and courage fighting bitter battles in Vietnam. The 101st established an extraordinary helicopter force of troops trained and ready for combat in Vietnam. Dense jungle and uneven terrain made the use of helicopters highly desirable for maneuverability and aided in the Tet Offensive.

The 101st Airborne Division (Air Mobile) was designated the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) in October 1974. The Screaming Eagles continued their rendezvous with destiny by faithfully completing combat missions in the Middle East, and humanitarian and peacekeeping missions in Rwanda, Somalia, Haiti, and in Bosnia. During the 1990 invasion of Kuwait, the division

conducted the largest air assault in history.

Today, the 101st continues their history of exemplary combat service to our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Thousands of men and women proudly wear the patch of the Screaming Eagle on their right shoulder as they deploy to defend the liberties that we enjoy here in the United States. Today, we recognize the Screaming Eagles and the hundreds of thousands of their brethren in uniform who volunteer to defend our Nation each and every day.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution honoring the extraordinary service and exceptional sacrifice of all those who have served and are serving in the 101st Airborne Division known as the Screaming Eagles.

For more than 65 years, since its formation in 1942, the division has established a record of bravery, commitment, military prowess and excellence that marks it as one of the great military units in American history.

When activated, the division's first commander told his men that, while the division had no history, it had a "rendezvous with destiny." And through five wars, the soldiers of that division have never failed that vision.

In World War II, from Normandy to Holland to Bastogne, and Hitler's Eagle's Nest, the division fought with great distinction. More than 2,000 of its members died defending freedom. Deployed to Vietnam for 7 years, the division never failed to accomplish any mission.

Though few of its battles became household names, the division's 4,000 deaths and 17 Medals of Honor are evidence of the unhesitating courage and sacrifice the division has made in Southeast Asia.

Today, tens of thousands of the 101st soldiers have deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, helping to secure liberty for those nations, denying a safe haven to terrorists, and helping to protect America's interests.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that we honor the 101st Airborne Division as one of the great American military units. More importantly, we must recognize and honor the tremendous debt that we owe to all who have served so well in this storied and historic division.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. WHITFIELD, for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may con-

sume to my friend and colleague from Kentucky, Mr. ED WHITFIELD.

Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) as well as Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member HUNTER for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

As has been said, Fort Campbell, Kentucky is the home of the 101st Airborne Division known as the Screaming Eagles, which is the only air assault division in the world. It has been my distinct privilege and pleasure to represent the First Congressional District of Kentucky, which is the home of this great unit.

I would also like to say that, while this resolution focuses explicitly on the 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell is also the home of the 160th Special Aviation Regiment, the Fifth Special Forces Group, the 86th Combat Support Hospital, and we have many young men and women also serving at the Blanchfield Army Hospital as well as the Garrison Command at Fort Campbell.

I was delighted that the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Alabama talked briefly about the history of this great 101st Airborne Division. I might say that, throughout its history, 19 individuals of that unit have received the highest declaration offered by the U.S. Government, which is the Medal of Honor.

Since Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom began, thousands of members of the 101st Airborne Division have been deployed no less than three times, performing dangerous counter-insurgency operations and working to secure liberty in nations that once served as safe havens for terrorists.

I might also say that we pay special tribute to the nearly 200 members of the 101st Division who have lost their lives fighting the global war on terrorism, and throughout its proud history over 6,000 have lost their lives.

Despite the dangers and difficulties faced by these soldiers and their loved ones, I might say that 65 percent reenlist and request to stay with the 101st Airborne Division, which certainly demonstrates the loyalty to the proud history and tradition of this unit.

I'd like to thank all of the cosponsors of this resolution. The brave soldiers of the 101st Airborne Division have never hesitated to answer this Nation's call to duty, and it is my great privilege to honor them with this resolution.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to salute Mr. WHITFIELD's and Mr. ROGERS' fine comments. They've said it all.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1080, a resolution honoring the extraordinary service and sac-

rifice of the Screaming Eagles of the 101st Airborne Division of the United States Army and their families. I am proud to represent in this chamber a portion of Fort Campbell, where the Screaming Eagles are based.

This resolution is especially timely as soldiers from the 101st Airborne Division are currently deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq. In April, Major General Jeffrey Schloesser, who commands the Screaming Eagles, took over as the senior U.S. commander in Afghanistan. Under General Schloesser, the 101st Airborne Division took over command of Regional Command East, an area comprised of 14 provinces in eastern Afghanistan. At the same time, three Brigade Combat Teams from the 101st Airborne Division are serving in Iraq. Many of the soldiers have been deployed multiple times in Afghanistan and Iraq, some of those deployments under the command of General David Petraeus, now the Commander of U.S. Central Command.

One need only look at the history of the Screaming Eagles to understand the legacy of the 101st Airborne Division. Originally activated during World War I, the Screaming Eagles would go on to serve in World War II, Vietnam, and Desert Storm, along with their most recent deployments to Afghanistan and Iraq.

During World War II, the soldiers of the 101st Airborne Division would have the distinction of being the first Americans to land in France as part of the D-Day invasion. Nearly 60 years later, the Screaming Eagles became the first conventional unit to deploy in the Global War on Terror; participated in Operation Anaconda, a tough early battle in Afghanistan; and help lead the invasion into Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for joining us today to honor the 101st Airborne Division, the men and women who have earned their place in history. They and their families will be in our thoughts and prayers as they continue to serve with distinction.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1080, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION OF CONGRESS TO THE FAMILIES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 295) expressing the deepest appreciation of Congress to the families of members of the United States Armed Forces.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 295

Whereas more than 2,000,000 Americans are demonstrating their devotion to the United States and freedom by serving in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas there are a multitude of family members, including mothers, fathers, siblings, spouses, and children, supporting each member of the Armed Forces;

Whereas, even in peacetime, the family of a member of the Armed Forces makes concessions given the inherent dangers of military service and the frequent relocations resulting in disruption of everyday routine;

Whereas, during wartime, family members endure increased sacrifices, forgo time with their loved one, and face increased worry and uncertainty when their loved one serves extended tours overseas or engages in enhanced training activities;

Whereas an increasing number of family members have taken on volunteer responsibilities in organizations associated with the Armed Forces;

Whereas the family of a member of the Armed Forces wounded in action willingly accepts the additional role of caregiver, even when it requires postponement of personal goals;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces serve as a pillar of strength and encouragement for those serving the interests of the United States at home and abroad; and

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces play a critical role in providing emotional support and readjustment assistance as members transition from military life to civilian life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress expresses its deepest appreciation to the families, both immediate and extended, of members of the United States Armed Forces for the unwavering support, both physical and emotional, that family members give their loved ones while they answer the call to serve their country and keep the United States safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Current Resolution 295, which expresses the deep appreciation of Congress to the families of members of the United States Armed Services.

□ 1500

Over 2 million American men and women are serving in the Armed Forces today. These military men and women have parents, spouses, and children who are being asked to sacrifice their time with their loved one. Given

the high operational tempo, these families have faced continued and sustained separation from their servicemember, many of whom have been deployed more than one time.

Living without the support of a beloved servicemember can be a daily struggle, and especially so for young children. Even so, our military families rise to the challenge with incredible strength and perseverance. These families are proud to know that the sacrifices that they and their loved one makes are to serve the country they love.

When a member returns home, it is our military families who are there for warriors. They provide our first line of defense to ensure that warriors who are wounded or need assistance receive the help that they have earned and deserve. Families are often the first to identify the needs of their loved one and to help ensure that those needs are met. Many families have made tremendous sacrifices to support their wounded warrior, often giving up their own personal goals to ensure that our wounded warriors are well cared for.

Military families are also unsurpassed in their devotion to their military communities. We depend on military family members who volunteer to support units and other families. As the demand has only increased over time with repeated deployments, the responsibilities that these family members have undertaken has also increased tenfold. These are Americans who answer the call in their hearts to serve the men and women who protect our homeland. Their strength, compassion, and unselfish sacrifice truly epitomize all that is good about the American spirit.

House Concurrent Resolution 295 is our way in the Congress of expressing our sincerest appreciation to our military families for the unwavering support that they give to the men and women who serve to keep the United States safe. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 295, which expresses the deepest appreciation of Congress to the families of members of the United States Armed Forces. I would like to thank Mr. BILIRAKIS of Florida for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute today to the force behind the force: the military family. It has long been known that the military services recruit individuals but we retain families. This has never been more true or more critical than it is today.

The support our troops receive from their loving families—mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, spouses, and children—is intangible but it is nothing less than a powerful force multiplier.

Today millions of Americans have one or more family members serving in the Armed Forces. These incredible families attempt to lead normal lives while their loved ones stand in harm's way, fulfilling our Nation's oath to serve and protect. The strength of the military family is astounding. Military parents give their sons and daughters to our Nation and pray relentlessly for their safe return. They look forward to every letter and phone call, while fearing the ringing of the phone and the doorbell at the same time.

As we celebrate military families, let us not forget the sacrifices of the children. Military children are special in their strength and their maturity. They do not always have "home-towns," but they have a heightened sense of family both in the traditional sense and in the special characteristics of the military community.

Military families have an uncanny resilience. They are some of the strongest citizens in this country, and I am privileged to recognize them not only today but every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important resolution. Without the support of our military families, the Armed Forces would not be the incredible power they are today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague and leader, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we recall that our Nation has been at war for over 6 years. It is often in times of conflict that our uniformed services are called upon, as in wartime now, to extraordinary duty.

It is their families that we seem from time to time to forget, but the support of their families is so very important. They are a very special group. Military families regularly face months of separation, one, two, three, and in some cases, four deployments. Children being born—I recall, Mr. Speaker, not all that long ago coming into port and then helicoptered out to the USS *Harry S. Truman* and seeing a good number of sailors being allowed to leave the ship first to meet their family and to meet the newborn children of those families that they had never seen before. Stories of children being born, of precious moments like graduations and birthdays being separated.

I think it is important that we in Congress recognize the importance and give moral support and comfort and thanks to those military families who bond together in times of crisis and help each other. And I think it's incumbent upon every American not only to say thanks and show appreciation to those we see in uniform but to do the same thing for the spouses and the children in those wonderful families.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 295, which I introduced. I would like to thank Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member HUNTER for allowing this resolution to come to the floor. I also want to thank Mr. COURTNEY and, of course, Mr. ROGERS.

Among the many things that make our Nation so great is our strong and valiant military. The strength, courage, and dedication of the men and women in uniform keep us safe at home from threats abroad. While Congress rightfully has and continues to recognize these men and women, so too should we honor their family members who serve as constant pillars of strength for them.

Behind each and every one of the more than 2 million individuals serving in the United States Armed Forces is a multitude of family members, be it mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, spouses, aunts, uncles, extended family, offering encouragement and providing the emotional and physical support our defenders need to successfully protect our Nation. These family members make daily sacrifices as they forgo time with their loved ones and face increased worry and uncertainty as members of the Armed Forces serve extended tours abroad and engage in more frequent training missions.

Even under the most difficult circumstances, when one of our soldiers is wounded in action, these families willingly take on the role of caregiver. They selflessly postpone their personal goals and rearrange their lives to meet the physical and emotional needs of their loved ones as they transition back to civilian life.

Our members of the Armed Forces are able to exhibit the level of strength and devotion that is their trademark, in part because of the network of support that they know they have at home. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 295, which recognizes the integral role the families of our servicemembers play in defense of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and privilege that I rise today to express my deepest appreciation to the immediate and extended families of the members of the Armed Forces for their unwavering support that they provide to our Nation's heroes. I urge all my colleagues to do the same by supporting this resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 295.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 297) recognizing the 60th anniversary of the integration of the United States Armed Forces, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 297

Whereas the United States has always had strong Armed Forces made up of courageous men and women serving the ideals of duty, honor, and country;

Whereas the Armed Forces were unfortunately once a place of segregation of the races;

Whereas despite segregation, minority members of the Armed Forces, such as the Tuskegee Airmen, who trained at historic Moton Field in Macon County, Alabama, demonstrated honor and bravery above and beyond the call of duty;

Whereas the bravery and sacrifice of all members of the Armed Forces regardless of race during World War II and prior conflicts is a matter of national honor;

Whereas the integration of the Armed Forces beginning in 1948 was a seminal event in our Nation's history and instilled the democratic ideal of equality in the military; and

Whereas the continued bravery and dedication of every member of the Armed Forces continues to be a source of pride to every American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress to honorably and respectfully recognize the historic significance and to celebrate the 60th Anniversary of President Truman's Executive Order 9981 signed on July 26, 1948 that declared it to be the policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin thereby beginning the process of ending segregation in the United States Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 297, which recognizes the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the integration of the Armed Forces.

Our military men and women are representative of the fabric of American society. They originate from every region of the world and represent the beautiful diversity of our planet. They bring forth with them a wide array of diverse talents and skill sets that has long made the U.S. military the superpower it is today.

House Concurrent Resolution 297 celebrates the 60th anniversary of President Harry Truman's 1948 executive order declaring that the equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Forces was the policy of the President. We celebrate this seminal event in our Nation's history for installing the democratic ideals of equality in our military and our country.

During the Second World War, the Tuskegee Airmen broke the color barrier within the Armed Forces to become the first black pilots, navigators, and bombardiers. It was the impenetrable code created from the Navajo language and utilized by the Navajo Code Talkers that helped save lives in the Pacific. Japanese American soldiers volunteered to serve in uniform while their families were held in concentration camps in the United States. It was the ingenuity of refugee scientists escaping anti-Semitism in their homeland that led to the American acquisition of nuclear technology. Diversity has made our Armed Forces and our Nation safer and stronger.

Unfortunately, our Armed Forces was once a place of discrimination and segregation. Many Americans of African, Asian, and Hispanic descent who served in the Armed Forces struggled against frequent episodes of racism and bigotry. Often these American servicemembers felt that they were fighting two wars, one against a foreign enemy and the other against racism from within their own ranks.

Despite great adversity, Americans of minority descent proudly served with honor and bravery, above and beyond the call of duty. We in Congress recognize their contributions and honor them for their sacrifices. The bravery and sacrifice of all members of the Armed Forces, regardless of race, color, or creed, will always be a matter of national honor.

Today the multi-racial makeup of our troops is a testament to the democratic ideals that all Americans hold dear, that all men and women are created equal. Our diverse forces serve as a proud example for the rest of the world in these times of racial and religious intolerance.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the beginning of integration in the United States Armed Forces.

□ 1515

Throughout the course of our Nation's history, the men and women of the armed services have defended our liberties with bravery, honor and sacrifice. But because our Nation racially segregated its military prior to 1948, generations of African Americans selflessly served our Nation with the knowledge that they were fighting abroad for many of the freedoms that they were frequently denied here at home. Despite this injustice, not only did African Americans serve honorably to fight for all our freedoms, they did so with dignity and bravery that earned many of them our Nation's top military honors.

One of the most important events in our Nation's history that helped move our country toward a more integrated America occurred on July 26, 1948, when President Harry S. Truman signed Executive Order 9981. This important order, which we acknowledge with this resolution today, ordered that there be equality of treatment with all persons in the armed services regardless of race, color, religion or national origin.

Even though it took years to accomplish the complete integration of the armed services, it was Executive Order 9981 that began the process.

Of the many units that served with distinction, I particularly would like to recognize the contributions of the Tuskegee Airmen, who trained at historic Moton Field in my congressional district in Alabama.

As most of us know, over the course of World War II, the Tuskegee Airmen became one of the most highly decorated units in the Armed Forces. These brave pilots destroyed more than 1,000 German aircraft while accumulating an unprecedented record of flying more than 200 bomber escort missions over central and southern Europe.

These brave Americans served without the loss of a single bomber to enemy aircraft and returned home with some of our Nation's highest military honors. But they also returned home to a racially segregated America. It's that injustice, and the steps our Nation has taken to help right that wrong, that we are helping recognize today. I'm also delighted that this body will help further recognize the occasion with a ceremony in the Capitol Rotunda later this month.

I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and Chairman SKELTON for allowing this resolution today. I'd also like to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida, Mr. KENDRICK MEEK, for his strong support of this resolution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from the State of Missouri, the same State that brought us President Harry Truman, Mr. IKE SKELTON.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank my friend from Connecticut for yielding and take this opportunity to mention the fact that my fellow Missourian, President Harry S. Truman, on the 26th day of July, 1948, signed Executive Order 9981 establishing the "policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services with regard to race, color, religion, or national origin." That executive order also established the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in our armed services.

On the 23rd of this month, our Congress will recognize the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the process of integration for our military.

African American men and women have served this Nation with honor, courage, commitment, even as they were denied the basic constitutional freedoms promised to all Americans. Their successful integration of forces paved the way for further integration of women, Asians, Hispanics, and other ethnic minorities.

The cosmopolitan make-up of our armed services is a testament to the American value that we hold dear, that all men are created equal. It is also a reflection of our society that we should treat all individuals, regardless of their race, their color, or national origin with respect and with dignity. And with these days of conflict, our forces, our military forces of our country, are an example of what can be achieved by respecting one's differences and working together to achieve a common goal.

House Concurrent Resolution 297 recognizes the 60th anniversary. I applaud those who have sponsored it, and I applaud the fact that we are taking it up today and recognizing the importance of this anniversary.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time at this time so I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey who serves on the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much for yielding.

Let me commend the sponsor of this great resolution and also let me just commend Representative SKELTON for the outstanding work that he has done for so many years in the Armed Services Committee.

I stand in support of this resolution, H. Con. Res. 297, because as we all know, there were many, many African Americans who have fought valiantly

through many of the wars. I'm very proud to have an uncle who just passed away 2 years ago, 3 years ago, who was in the invasion of Normandy. I used to recall as a young boy receiving the letters that he would send that were photocopied and made about the size of your hand where anything they felt was strategic was blacked out. And my Uncle John was a staff sergeant. As I mentioned, he was in the invasion of Normandy. And his wife, Ruth Garrett, who is still alive, worked in Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey for the war effort making weapons for our armed services. He was very proud when the World War II monument was opened, and he proudly sat with his uniform and his cap and his medals and made us very, very proud of his service. Even today, one of my employees, Richard Turner, is serving in Iraq.

But there have been African Americans who have served for so many years. It took Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to fly with the Tuskegee Airmen for them to finally allow the Tuskegee Airmen to fly in combat because there was resistance to that. And as we know, the first person, as a matter of fact, to die in the Revolutionary War was Crispus Attucks back in 1770 on March 5 when he and four other patriots were taken down by the British to start the Revolutionary War in the Battle of Bunker Hill where we had Crispus, and where we had Salem Poor who fought at the battle of Bunker Hill. And we can go on and on.

A neighbor of mine, Needham Roberts and Sergeant Henry Johnson, captured 30 German soldiers in World War I and kept them captive for over a month. And people wondered how two soldiers could have kept so many enemy soldiers at bay. And so I am so proud to have this recognition and certainly pay tribute to Harry S. Truman. He was a person who had said "the buck stops here." He was from Missouri. He said that he'll take the heat, and he did.

And so I would just like to once again commend so many of the men and women who continue even today to show their appreciation and strength for our Nation as they serve valiantly in the United States Armed Services.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride that I rise to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the integration of the Armed Forces. As I stand here today, our forces around the world are united in their efforts to preserve our liberty; however, it was not long ago that the men and women of the Armed Forces faced forced division, even while protecting our unity.

African Americans have been essential to the creation and preservation of our Nation. These valiant men and women fought abroad for freedom and security in segregated units, while their own families were subject to oppression and inequality on the home front. Despite this, African-American troops still honored the ideals of the United States and courageously defended the country; many of them would go on to earn top military honors.

Fortunately the United States military would not remain so divided. On July 26, 1948,

GENERAL LEAVE

President Harry Truman signed Executive Order 9981, mandating the equal treatment of all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. In addition to beginning the process of immigration, Executive Order 9981 also established the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services. While it would take years for the integration of the armed services to be completed, it was Executive Order 9981 which began to pave the path to unity.

The Revolutionary War was spurred by a document, the Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed, "All men are created equal". Many African Americans fought in the Revolution, while experiencing unequal treatment. Another document, Executive Order 9981, authored by President Truman, was able to begin the integration of the armed services, which ended this pervasive inequality and segregation. The signing of Executive Order 9981 was a pivotal moment in our history and I wholeheartedly support its commemoration.

I commend my colleagues, Representatives MIKE ROGERS and KENDRICK MEEK, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 297, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3564) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States through fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 2, lines 9 through 11, strike "\$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, \$3,300,000 for fiscal year 2009, \$3,400,000 for fiscal year 2010, and \$3,500,000 for fiscal year 2011" and insert "\$3,200,000 for fiscal year 2009, \$3,200,000 for fiscal year 2010, and \$3,200,000 for fiscal year 2011".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal regulation process is one of the most important ways by which our Nation implements public policy. Each year, agencies issue thousands of regulations to promote safety in our lives, from the food we eat, to the cars we drive, to the air we breathe.

Although regulations play a critical role in protecting so many aspects of our daily lives, there is no independent, nonpartisan entity that Congress can rely upon to help us ensure that these regulations are working as intended.

The Administrative Conference of the United States was just such an entity, a public-private think tank that provided invaluable guidance to Congress about how to improve the administrative and regulatory process.

First authorized by President John F. Kennedy, the Conference made numerous recommendations over the course of its 27-year existence, many of which were enacted into law. The conference was last funded into in 1995. H.R. 3564, the Regulatory Improvement Act of 2007, would reauthorize it for 3 years.

Some might ask why we are reauthorizing an entity that has been out of existence for so long. Let me mention three important reasons. First, the Conference can save taxpayer dollars, in fact, millions of dollars. When it was in existence, it helped agencies implement many cost-saving procedures and make numerous recommendations to eliminate excessive litigation costs and long delays.

Just one agency alone, the Social Security Administration, estimated that the Conference's recommendation to change that agency's appeal process yielded approximately \$85 million in savings. Indeed, Justice Stephen Breyer testified before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law about the "huge" savings to the public resulting from the Conference's recommendations. Justice Antonin Scalia likewise agreed that it was an enormous bargain.

Second, the Administrative Conference promoted innovation among agencies. For example, it convinced 24 agencies to use alternative dispute resolution for issues concerning the private sector. The Conference also spearheaded implementation of the Negotiated Rulemaking Act, the Equal Access to Justice Act, and the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, governing consumer product warranties.

The Conference played a major role in encouraging agencies to promulgate

smarter regulations. It did this by working to improve the public's understanding and participation in the rule-making process, promoting judicial review of agency regulations, and reducing regulatory burdens on the private sector.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, Congress needs the conference. Experience with the Congressional Review Act proves that there are limitations in Congress' ability to provide aggressive oversight of the regulatory process.

Congressional recognition of the Conference's significant contributions to the regulatory process is probably best evidenced by the fact that legislation assigning responsibilities to it continues to be introduced in nearly every Congress, including the current one.

The Congressional Research Service advises that reactivation of the Conference now would come at "an opportune time," especially in light of efforts by the White House to augment its involvement in the regulatory process.

There are few entities that have enjoyed more bipartisan support than the Administrative Conference, and understandably so. It is all about promoting good government.

I commend my colleague, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, CHRIS CANNON of Utah, for his leadership in continuing to pursue reauthorization of the conference.

Last October, the House passed this bill on suspension by voice vote without amendment. The Senate late last month finally acted and passed the bill with a small amendment which essentially reauthorizes the Conference at a level of funding in the amount of \$3.2 million.

I urge my colleagues to concur in the Senate amendment so we can send this bill to the President.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend from California for his work on this bill, and thank the chairman of the committee and also the ranking members of the subcommittee and committee.

I am delighted to see us conclude today our consideration of H.R. 3564 which would reauthorize the Administrative Conference of the United States. The bill we consider today was amended slightly by the Senate which required this action by us today. But I strongly urge the House to concur in the Senate's amendment today. I also urge the Appropriations Committee and the House to appropriate funds promptly to ACUS. We need this exemplary agency once again to become a living, breathing entity and reality.

So why is that? As the distinguished Member from Utah (Mr. CANNON) remarked when we originally voted out the bill, and quoting from prior adage,

"The government that governs best, governs least. And when the government does govern, it should govern at its best." He is exactly right. That is the role of ACUS, to ensure that when the government acts, it acts at its best.

The small appropriations that we historically invested in ACUS yielded us major overall savings in time and in money. ACUS consistently pinpointed ways for the government to reduce the cost it incurs and that it imposes. As we confront the specter of exploding Social Security and Medicare entitlement costs hijacking the Federal budget, we need ACUS all the more. We must do everything we can to avoid waste in our spending and to lighten the government burden on our economy. By reauthorizing and refunding ACUS, we can take important steps in that effort. I again thank the gentleman from California for his work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many more speakers my colleague from Texas has remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and I thank the Speaker as well as the work of Mr. CANNON of Utah. I urge passage of the bill.

As we have seen most recently in the actions and inactions by the FDA dealing with the salmonella incidents, or whether it is the Consumer Product Safety Commission and some of the issues involving manufactured products from other countries, the regulatory process is extraordinarily important in protecting the American people. Congress is doing its best to oversee these agencies, but we can use the assistance of this important conference, and I join my colleague in urging passage of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3564, Regulatory Improvement Act of 2007. The administrative conference was first created inside the Department of Justice by President Kennedy. Later, it was moved out of the Department of Justice by President Johnson. The mission was a private partnership to discuss administrative law and regulatory system and how to make it better. Supreme Court Justices Breyer and Scalia served on the Conference before becoming Justices and both have testified in the past for its reauthorization. This bill reauthorizes the Administrative Conference. I support this bill and I encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

The Administrative Conference of the United States (ACUS), an independent agency and advisory committee created in 1968, studied U.S. administrative processes with an eye to recommending improvements to Congress and agencies. From 1968 to 1995, the ACUS issued approximately 200 recommendations, most of which have been at least partially implemented. Congressional funding for ACUS was terminated in 1995.

ACUS's recommendations were published periodically in the Code of Federal Regulations prior to 1995. Little known "outside the

Beltway," ACUS was a unique entity. Comprised of between 75 and 101 individuals drawn from agencies, academia, and the private sector, the Conference was classified as both an independent agency and a federal advisory committee. Organizationally, it consisted of a Chair, a Council, and an Assembly. The Chair, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a five-year term, was responsible for the day-to-day activities and supervision of the 18 permanent staff. The Council, which functioned like a board of directors, consisted of ten members appointed by the President for three-year terms, five of whom were always current senior federal officials. The Assembly was made up of the Chair, the Council, and the other members of the Conference, a majority of whom had to come from government service. All of the members (other than the Chair) served without compensation.

The primary, although not exclusive, function of the Conference was to study administrative processes with an eye to recommending improvements to Congress and the agencies. It performed this function by commissioning studies by law professors expert in the administrative process that then were reviewed by one of six standing committees: adjudication, administration, governmental processes, judicial review, regulation, and rulemaking. The recommendations developed by committees of the Conference would be considered for adoption by the Assembly in plenary sessions, which were typically held twice a year.

The improvements occasioned by the Conferences recommendations are legion. Inasmuch as the Conference never had the power to impose its recommendations on unwilling subjects, the fact that so many of its recommendations bore fruit is a testimony to their intrinsic sense. Some, like the Conference's recommendation in 1968, its first year of operation, to eliminate a jurisdictional amount in suits under the APA, were followed by Congress in passing new legislation. Another example is its recommendation to provide administrative penalty authority to agencies to increase the effectiveness of agency enforcement activities at lower cost, first proposed by the Conference in 1972 and since adopted by Congress in over 200 statutes. A third is its 1980 recommended solution to unseemly races to the courthouse in rulemaking appeals, adopted by Congress in 1988.

Other recommendations, like the Conference's early recommendation to eliminate the exemption from the APA's notice-and-comment requirements for rules relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, and contracts, were sufficiently influential to lead agencies to adopt the recommendations on their own. Its recommendation in 1988 on Presidential Transition Workers' Code of Ethical Conduct were used by President Bush as the basis for his transition standards of conduct, and the Clinton administration likewise followed what had become standard procedures. From 1968 to 1995, the Conference issued approximately 200 recommendations, most of which have been at least partially implemented.

Probably the area in which the Conference had its greatest influence was in introducing and supporting the use of alternative dispute resolution techniques in agency practice. Its recommendation in 1982 provided procedures

by which agencies could negotiate proposed regulations, and it followed the recommendation with support and encouragement to agencies to experiment with this new technique. Ultimately, Congress adopted the Negotiated Rulemaking Act in 1990, virtually copying the procedures contained in the Conference's original recommendation. Similarly, in 1986 the Conference issued the first of some fifteen recommendations on using alternative means of dispute resolution in agency adjudications. In 1990 Congress again followed the Conference's lead and enacted the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act. Recognizing the Conference's leadership role in this area, that Act gave the Conference the principal role for coordinating and promoting ADR in the federal government.

Another area in which the Conference had a major influence involved its study of Presidential review of agency rulemaking undertaken during the Reagan administration. This was a subject that had the potential to become highly partisan, but the Conference's reputation for neutrality and expertise enabled it to review the practice, generally validate its exercise, and makes certain recommendations to improve its openness and public acceptability. Because of the Conference's track record of useful and expert studies of the administrative process, all the regulatory reform bills considered by the Senate in the last session included provisions for the Conference to study the effects of the legislation.

The Conference's contribution to administrative law and procedure was not limited just to studies. Drawing on its expertise, ACUS issued numerous publications designed to assist agencies in their administrative processes. For example, in 1972 the Conference published the first edition of its Manual for Administrative Law Judges (now in its 3d edition); in 1978 it published its Interpretive Guide to the Government in the Sunshine Act; in 1981 it issued Model Rules for Agency Implementation of the Equal Access to Justice Act. The latter two of these documents were responsive to Congress' requirement for agencies to consult with the Conference in implementing these statutes. In addition, the Conference has published sourcebooks on Federal Administrative Procedure, Negotiated Rulemaking, and Alternative Dispute Resolution, as well as the Guide to Federal Agency Rulemaking.

Finally, in recent years, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Congress authorized the Conference to lend its expertise to newly emerging democracies in their creation of administrative law and procedures. As a result, the Conference sponsored seminars in the Ukraine, Hungary, the People's Republic of China, and South Africa.

The ABA has long been a strong supporter of the Conference, and over the years the Conference and the Section on Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice have enjoyed a close and mutually supportive relationship. This bill reauthorizes the administrative conference.

I support this Act and encourage my colleagues to support it also.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3564.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THURGOOD MARSHALL ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 381) honoring and recognizing the dedication and achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 381

Whereas Thurgood Marshall was born in Baltimore, Maryland, on July 2, 1908, the grandson of a slave;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall developed an interest in the Constitution and the rule of law in his youth;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall graduated from Lincoln University in Pennsylvania with honors in 1930, but was denied acceptance at the all-white University of Maryland Law School because he was African-American;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall attended law school at Howard University, the country's most prominent black university, and graduated first in his class in 1933;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall served as the legal director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) from 1940 to 1961;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall argued 32 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States, beginning with the case of *Chambers v. Florida* in 1940, and won 29 of them, earning more victories in the Supreme Court than any other individual;

Whereas, as Chief Counsel of the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall fought to abolish segregation in schools and challenged laws that discriminated against African-Americans;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall argued *Brown v. Board of Education* before the Supreme Court in 1954, which resulted in the famous decision declaring racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional, overturning the 1896 decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson*;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall was nominated to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit by President John F. Kennedy in 1961, and was confirmed by the United States Senate in spite of heavy opposition from many Southern Senators;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall served on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from 1961 to 1965, during which time he wrote 112 opinions, none of which were overturned on appeal;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall was nominated as Solicitor General of the United States by President Lyndon Johnson, and served as the first African-American Solicitor General from 1965 to 1967;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall was nominated as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court by President Johnson in 1967, and served as the first African-American member of the Supreme Court;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall sought to protect the rights of all Americans during his 24 years as a justice on the Supreme Court;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall was honored with the Liberty Medal in 1992, in recogni-

tion of his long history of protecting the rights of women, children, prisoners, and the homeless; and

Whereas Thurgood Marshall died on January 24, 1993, at the age of 84: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors the dedication and achievements of Thurgood Marshall;

(2) recognizes the contributions of Thurgood Marshall to the struggle for equal rights and justice in the United States; and

(3) celebrates the lifetime achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commemorates the life and work of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth, which was July 2, 1908.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for his leadership in allowing us to recognize an American whose life work was marked by the principles of justice, equality, and freedom, and I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation.

It is hard to know where to begin in reciting Justice Marshall's accomplishments. While best known for breaking the color barrier on the Supreme Court, Justice Marshall is honored because he was an expert jurist who worked on behalf of all Americans. Born 100 years ago in Baltimore, Maryland, and with just one generation between him and slavery, Thurgood Marshall experienced its legacy of segregation and racist hatred in his own time.

Rather than allow that legacy to defeat him, however, he dedicated his life to removing its stain from our society. His courageous determination propelled him to success in the classroom, in the courtroom, and on the bench.

When he was denied admission on the basis of race to the University of Maryland's School of Law, he attended Howard University's School of Law and graduated first in his class in 1933.

When he challenged the separate-but-equal status quo in his capacity as legal director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, from 1940 through 1961, he won 29 out of 32 cases before the Supreme Court, the most Supreme Court cases won by any attorney.

Later, as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from 1961 to 1965, he would author 112 opinions, with not one of them being overturned.

Thurgood Marshall would continue his service to this country in two very distinguished capacities. He served as the first African American Solicitor General, from 1965 until 1967. That year, he was appointed associate justice on the U.S. Supreme Court, the first African American Justice, where he served until he retired in 1991.

While Justice Marshall is best known for his lead role in the cases culminating in the 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which laid the foundation for the dismantling of Jim Crow segregation, he fought racial segregation in every aspect of society, and this pursuit for a fair and just America made him one of the Nation's best advocates of civil rights.

In *Chambers v. Florida*, he challenged a biased criminal justice system. In *Shelley v. Kraemer*, he challenged discrimination in housing. And in *Smith v. Allwright*, he challenged inequitable voting practices.

Finally, in commemorating Justice Marshall, we acknowledge not just a good lawyer and judge, but a good man who reminded us that "in recognizing the humanity of our fellow beings, we pay ourselves the highest tribute."

Thurgood Marshall should be remembered as an individual who raised the morale, spirit and conscience of this country and who tirelessly fought social injustice throughout his life.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution that calls upon us to recognize the important legacy of Thurgood Marshall, a man who challenged and inspired Americans to live up to the principles and ideals on which this country was founded.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my friend from California, I thank the chairman of the committee, the ranking member of the committee, and those who have worked on this bill.

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 381 honoring and recognizing the dedication and achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Thurgood Marshall, born in Baltimore, Maryland, on July 2, 1908, was the grandson of a slave. But after graduating first in his class from Howard Law School in 1933, he went on to serve as the legal director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and argued over 30 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States. He won 29 of them, including the landmark decision *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, which held that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional.

Thurgood Marshall, as most people know, was later nominated to the United States Court of Appeals for the

Second Circuit by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. He served there as the first African American Solicitor General from 1965 to 1967. And in 1967, he was nominated by President Johnson to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court, its first African American member.

I recall the days before I took the oath as a district judge back in Texas. I was told by a retired judge who was dying of cancer that it was a good job and a noble job, but that it would be the loneliest job I had ever held. I can only imagine that would have been true for any Supreme Court Justice, but particularly true for the first African American Justice on the Supreme Court. It had to be a lonely job; yet he honored himself and he honored this country with his brilliant work.

Thurgood Marshall will be remembered for the many Supreme Court decisions he had a hand in writing, including the concurring opinion in *Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Amos*.

Justice Marshall made so much in the way of contributions that are so far-reaching and still very timely today. For example, we have had the remaining Presidential candidates of both political parties express support for allowing faith-based organizations to take part in Federal social service programs. So it is worth remembering that in the *Amos* case Justice Marshall joined with Justice Brennan in stating that section 702(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was constitutional. That section of the Civil Rights Act has, from its inception, exempted nonprofit, private religious organizations engaged in both religious and secular nonprofit activities from title VII's prohibition on discrimination in employment on the basis of religion. If religious organizations are to be allowed to join Federal social service efforts, they must be allowed to remain religious organizations, and they can only do so if they are allowed to be free to compose themselves of individuals who share their religious world view. Justice Marshall recognized that, and so should we.

He even had something to say about vouchers for education. In *Witters v. Washington Department of Services for the Blind*, Justice Marshall upheld a voucher program in which "vocational assistance is provided under a program that is paid directly to the student, who transmits it to the educational institution of his or her choice." Justice Marshall held that such programs are constitutional where the resources "ultimately flow to religious institutions as a result of the genuinely independent and private choices of aid recipients."

It is also worth noting that he did allow exception to the Civil Rights Act to allow religious institutions to hire people who agreed with their religious beliefs.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 381 in recognizing Jus-

tice Marshall's judicial legacy. It was profound, it was far-reaching, and it changed the country for the good. That rich legacy includes his support for the right of religious organizations to maintain their religious identity, for government voucher programs that allow individuals to exercise free and independent choices, even when those best choices or services are provided by religious organizations. It is a real honor for me to get to honor the legacy of Thurgood Marshall.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 1 minute to the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California (Mr. SCHIFF), congratulate Mr. PAYNE for his leadership on this effort, and Mr. GOHMERT for his joining in bringing this legislation to the floor.

I come from the State of Maryland, and Thurgood Marshall is one of the great sons of our State. But I must tell you something that you will find, I think, ironic. If you go to the State capitol which is the oldest State capitol still in use as a State capitol in this country, and you look on the east front of the capitol and you walk out the front, there is a statue on the east front that overlooks the Annapolis harbor, and that statue is of a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States from the State of Maryland. His name is Roger Brooke Taney, the author of the *Dred Scott* decision.

But if you walk out the door to the west and look out on Rowe Boulevard, there is another statue, another Justice, another son of Maryland; and that Justice is Thurgood Marshall.

□ 1545

I have always thought it somewhat ironic that juxtaposed in the Maryland State Capitol are these two justices, both of whom were learned, both of whom served their country, one of whom, however, whose judgment was skewed by the times in which he grew up, whose brilliance was diminished by his failure to see the promise of America, and another who—notwithstanding the fact that he was discriminated against and his people were discriminated against by a country that professed a promise of equal opportunity for all. Nevertheless, the love for his country rose above that segregated environment to preach the principles and to seek their reality.

Today we recall the life and legacy of one of America's champions of civil rights, Thurgood Marshall. Justice Marshall is, as I have said, one of Maryland's greatest sons.

If you come to my office and visit the majority leader's office, you will see, just outside of my door, six portraits of very distinguished Marylanders. One, the first President of the United States, John Hanson. Now, I know that George Washington was technically

first President of the United States of America, but John Hanson was the first president of the Continental Congress. You will see others, signers of the Declaration of Independence, but there will be that picture just outside of my door of Thurgood Marshall, because of what he stood for and what his life stands for today.

Few lives were as consequential to the cause of American equality, and it's fitting that we pause the work of legislating and remember that life. Thurgood Marshall said that his lifelong fascination with the Constitution began in grade school, when, as a punishment, interestingly, as a punishment, a teacher forced him to read it cover to cover. Even then he must have been struck by the gulf between that document's promise of equal protection and the reality of a segregated America, a gulf that turned that promise into a lie for millions of our citizens.

Thurgood Marshall spent his career working to restore that promise and dismantling the structures of segregation piece by piece. Nearly two decades before the famous case of *Brown vs. Board of Education*, he was at the forefront of a legal movement that aimed to chip away at discrimination through the courts.

His first victory was also in some ways his sweetest. He convinced the Maryland Court of Appeals to desegregate the University of Maryland law school 6 years after that very school had barred him on account of his race. Over the years to come, he rarely lost a case. In fact, he won 29 out of 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court.

Another famous Marylander and his wife, whom I know, is Speaker JACKSON, himself a distinguished African American leader of a distinguished African American family. I know so well the Mitchell family, Clarence Mitchell, Jr., the NAACP's representative in Washington, known as the 100th Senator; and Juanita Jackson Mitchell, one of the first African Americans admitted to the University of Maryland law school.

Some of the credit must go to Thurgood Marshall and his legendary powers of persuasion. But credit, I think, also belongs to the powerful simplicity of his argument that separate can never be equal, that the Constitution belongs to Americans of all colors. His career as an advocate culminated with *Brown*, which overturned "separate but equal," and it overturned it for good. Not only did it overturn it finally, but also for the good of our people.

Thurgood Marshall later distinguished himself as a Federal judge and a solicitor general before President Lyndon Johnson nominated him as America's first African American Supreme Court justice. President Johnson called the appointment, and I quote, "The right thing to do, the right time to do it, the right man, and the right place."

Justice Marshall, of course, as we all know, proved him absolutely correct.

He served on the Court with distinction for almost a quarter of a century as one of its leading defenders of individual liberty and civil rights. Other civil rights leaders gave us inspiration, uplift and prophetic challenge. Thurgood Marshall added something to that contribution, dogged advocacy and the discipline of the law.

As a newspaper editorial put it at the time of his death, "We make movies about Malcolm X, we get a holiday to honor Dr. Martin Luther King. But every day we live with the legacy of Justice Thurgood Marshall." Thurgood Marshall would be the first to acknowledge just how far America remains from the promise of equality, an equality that exists in fact, every bit as in law.

But he would be the last to be discouraged. He said that "A child born to a black mother in a State like Mississippi, by merely drawing its first breath in the democracy has exactly the same right as a white baby born to the wealthiest person in the United States. It's not true, but I challenge anyone to say it's not a goal worth working for."

The great thing that we remember about Thurgood Marshall, as I said at the beginning, is that confronted with segregation, confronted with racism, confronted with a negative reaction to his color, he, as so many civil rights leaders have done in the past, as Nelson Mandela did in South Africa, as so many other civil rights leaders throughout this world have done, he rose above the hate and the division to bring clarity to our Constitution and unity to our people.

How appropriate it is to remember Thurgood Marshall on the eve of his 100th year.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would yield to my friend, Mr. CHABOT from Ohio, such time as he may consume.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 381, a resolution recognizing the dedication and achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Justice Marshall's life was full of distinction and firsts, including successfully arguing to overturn the separate but equal doctrine before the U.S. Supreme Court and the seminal case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, serving as the Nation's first African American solicitor general and later serving as the first African American U.S. Supreme Court justice, a position that he held for 24 years.

Still, at an early age with the premise that all men are created equal, Justice Marshall dedicated his life to bringing meaning to the protections enshrined in our Constitution. His work transformed this Nation. First, at the NAACP and later in the public sector, Justice Thurgood Marshall put civil rights at the forefront of this Nation's conscience, ensuring that the

Constitution and rule of law applied fairly to all citizens.

I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PAYNE, for ensuring that Thurgood Marshall's legacy lives on. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Let me begin by thanking my fellow colleagues, Mr. SHERMAN included, who joined me in the cosponsorship of this commemorative resolution, which honors Justice Thurgood Marshall's legacy and his dedication to civil rights and public service.

Thurgood Marshall was born the grandson of a slave back in Baltimore, Maryland, on July 2, 1908. Marshall's mother, Norma Marshall, was one of the first black persons to graduate from Columbia Teacher's College in New York City. His father, William Canfield Marshall, worked as a railroad porter and as head steward at an exclusive white club. Mr. Marshall was the first black person to serve on a grand jury in Baltimore in the 20th century.

Thurgood Marshall grew up in Baltimore and graduated from an all-black high school at the age of 16. During his childhood, his parents taught him to argue by making him prove every statement he made and by challenging every point he made. At school, as it was mentioned earlier, when Thurgood Marshall got into trouble, the principal would make him sit in the basement and read the U.S. Constitution.

Students couldn't return to class until a section of the Constitution was memorized. Evidently Thurgood Marshall had an opportunity, because he memorized a great deal of the Constitution, but that moved him into the interest of being a lawyer rather than a dentist, which his mother wanted him to be.

After graduating from high school, Justice Marshall attended Lincoln University, a historically black university in Chester, Pennsylvania, a school that many outstanding blacks from the United States and abroad went to, including the first president of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah.

However, education was such a priority for the Marshall family that Mrs. Marshall sold her engagement ring in order to send Thurgood Marshall to school. After his graduation with honors at Lincoln University, Justice Marshall applied to the University of Maryland Law School. He was not accepted because he was black, and that set in motion the events of his future.

That same year, Marshall was accepted at Howard Law School, and he went on to graduate in the class of 1933. Upon graduating, Justice Marshall started his own practice in Baltimore. The next year he discovered the NAACP and became an active member.

As a matter of fact, Justice Marshall then sued the University of Maryland's law school, where he was not admitted,

and won the case about discrimination. So he did get justice in the end.

From 1940 to 1961, Thurgood Marshall served as legal director of the NAACP, which allowed him to travel throughout the United States representing numerous court cases. Most of the clients had disputes involving questions of racial justice, which ranged from common crimes to appellate advocacy, raising the most intricate matters of constitutional law.

I had the privilege to follow his work very closely, because I was then president in the middle 1950s of the NAACP youth councils in college chapters and attended the NAACP convention in Detroit in 1957 when Dr. Martin Luther King received the Spingarn Award.

Of course, Thurgood Marshall was still a person that we all admired. As we heard, out of the 32 cases, he won 29 of them, earning more Supreme Court victories than any other individual before the Supreme Court and as chief counsel of the NAACP, the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, which overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson* of 1897, saying that "separate but equal" was constitutional.

In 1961, John F. Kennedy appointed Thurgood Marshall to the United States Court of Appeals in the Second Circuit, despite heavy opposition from many southern Senators. Thurgood Marshall served on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from 1961 to 1965. As we heard, he wrote 112 opinions, none of which was overturned on appeal.

In 1965, President Johnson appointed Thurgood Marshall to the position of solicitor general, which he held from 1965 to 1967. Then in 1967, President Johnson appointed Thurgood Marshall as the first African American Justice to serve on the Supreme Court.

During his 24 years of service in the Supreme Court, Thurgood Marshall promoted affirmative action and sought protection for the rights of all Americans.

□ 1600

In 1992, he was honored with the Liberty Medal recognizing his long history of protecting individual rights of women, children, prisoners, and homeless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PAYNE. Justice Marshall once said, "Sometimes history takes things into its own hands." His commitment to civil rights and public service resonate still today. I ask you to listen to the words of Justice Marshall and strongly support this resolution by recognizing his contributions to humanity, acknowledged July 2, 2008, the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. But in the spirit with which Thurgood Marshall conducted himself, I can't help but think,

as the son of a teacher, that he would be pleased if the name of the teacher that may have changed history by having him memorize part of the Constitution had her or his name entered, and if no one on the floor knows who that is, Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent for 48 hours to revise and extend my remarks so that we get the name of that teacher that helped this student, Thurgood Marshall, change history be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I would now be delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, DANNY DAVIS.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for introducing this resolution. I was thinking that in 1954, I was a pre-adolescent, just beginning to read, write and try and understand what was going on. And where I lived, I remember the first school bus that I rode on was actually made from a flat-bed truck that Mr. Arthur Dooley had. And when the schools were consolidated, he put a cabin on it and some wooden benches, and that was my first ride on a school bus.

Then I remember the next year, we inherited a school bus from the white school. Then, I remember that all of the books that I read, all of the while that I was growing up, had someone else's name in the books when we got them, after they had been used by the other school system where I lived.

And so, when I think of Thurgood Marshall, not only do I think of the tremendous impact that he continues to have today, but I think of the impact that he had on the lives of individuals like myself, who lived in an environment that was obviously very separate and very unequal.

What he did will last as long as America lasts because he clearly showed that there could be an opportunity for people to experience some of what we call the goodness and the greatness of America. And for that reason, I come to commemorate him today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment to support H. Con. Res. 381, which celebrates the contributions and achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth. Born in Baltimore, Maryland, on July 2, 1908, Thurgood Marshall was the grandson of a slave and at an early age his father, William Marshall, instilled in him an appreciation for the United States Constitution and the rule of law. He attended undergraduate school at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. In 1930, he was accepted to Howard Law School; however, he also applied to the University of Maryland Law School, but was

denied admission because he was Black. This event caused the direction of his professional life to focus on equal desegregated education. As an African-American man who lived through segregation and oppression he once said, "Today's Constitution is a realistic document of freedom only because of several corrective amendments. Those amendments speak to a sense of decency and fairness that I and other Blacks cherish." As an attorney and during his tenure on the Supreme Court, Justice Marshall's opinions did much to advance the decency and fairness of our laws, making America a much stronger nation.

Thurgood Marshall's tireless work within the justice system to eradicate the legacy of slavery and destroy the racist segregation system of Jim Crow clearly demonstrated his dedication to the struggle for equal rights and justice in the United States. As chief legal counsel to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, he championed one of the most important cases for equal rights, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, the landmark case that demolished the legal basis for segregation in America. He continued to push for equal rights as the first African-American Supreme Court Justice, succeeding in creating new protections under law for women, children, prisoners, and the homeless. By these accomplishments, Thurgood Marshall established a record for supporting the voiceless Americans and left a legacy that recognizes that discrimination includes factors beyond just race and gender. He built a structure of individual rights that has become the cornerstone of protections for all Americans. I commemorate the years he has served and the improvements he has made to this great Nation.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 381, a resolution honoring one of the greatest legal minds and civil rights pioneers of the 20th century, Thurgood Marshall. I thank Congressman PAYNE for introducing this resolution and for his leadership on so many important issues.

When I think of 20th century trailblazers, Thurgood Marshall ranks among America's greatest heroes. It is an honor and a privilege to pay tribute to this legal giant as the House commemorates the 100th anniversary of his birth.

As Thurgood Marshall stated so eloquently, "A man can make what he wants of himself if he truly believes that he must be ready for hard work and many heartbreaks." His life's work truly embodied this quotation. Rising from the segregated streets of Baltimore, Maryland to the hallowed halls of the Supreme Court of the United States, Thurgood Marshall's story is one of triumph and courage. More than the first African-American Supreme Court Justice, Thurgood Marshall was a true pioneer whose selfless acts advanced the cause of civil rights not only in the United States, but around the world.

It was more than 50 years ago when Thurgood Marshall and his fellow Howard University School of Law colleagues and professors launched their campaign to topple the house Jim Crow built. They acted in the audacious belief that the citadel of "separate but equal" built on the foundation of *Plessey v. Ferguson* could be brought down. Thurgood Marshall's faith that justice will triumph over

power was vindicated when the Supreme Court issued its unanimous opinion in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. That decision outlawed de jure segregation in public education, and fueled an international civil rights revolution that continues to this day.

The victory in *Brown v. Board* was not Thurgood Marshall's first, nor would it be his last triumph before the Court he would later grace for nearly a quarter century. Thurgood Marshall was the principal architect of equality, working through the courts to eradicate the legacy of slavery and destroy the segregation system of Jim Crow.

There was *Shelley v. Kramer*, which held that racial restrictive covenants in housing were unconstitutional. There was *Smith v. Allwright*, which outlawed the infamous "dual primaries," excluding blacks from the voting in the primary election from which the general election winner always emerged. Before Thurgood Marshall ascended to the federal bench as Circuit Judge and later Supreme Court Associate Justice Marshall, he would argue 32 cases before the Supreme Court, tallying 29 victories, more than any other individual in history.

Thurgood Marshall's deep faith and commitment to the cause of equality was the key to his success and to the legacy he leaves us. The legal strategy he developed as the chief lawyer for the NAACP and the judicial philosophy he refined as a member of the Supreme Court reoriented the federal judiciary as champion and protector of civil rights and individual liberty. The Civil Rights Movement for which the *Brown* ruling gave momentum greatly influenced leaders who later fought for the rights of women, the disabled, the politically oppressed, and the environment. Even the media has Thurgood Marshall to thank for the enhanced protection of its liberties.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans are indebted to the late Justice Thurgood Marshall. Throughout his life, he bravely worked to help our country make real the promise of the Declaration of Independence, and extend the blessings and protections of our great Constitution to all Americans. His work honored America and so it is fitting that Congress pause to pay tribute to this great American by marking the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Margaret Mead said, "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed people can change the world; indeed, it is the only thing that ever has."

The remarkable life of Thurgood Marshall is irrefutable proof that one person can make a difference.

Happy Birthday, Justice Marshall.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation that honors an individual of unprecedented stature and achievement. This leader was a fighter who stood boldly on the front lines of democracy to fight for liberty and equality for all. This legal giant is none other than the late Thurgood Marshall.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said that we all can be great because we all can serve. It is my responsibility to pay tribute to the late great Thurgood Marshall who served our Nation by transforming it.

The late Thurgood Marshall put in place mechanisms to elevate the United States to its greatest potential. As a result, all Americans presently can reap the benefits of Thurgood

Marshall's arduous travail. One of his greatest victories was his work in the landmark Supreme Court case of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. In *Brown*, the Supreme Court ruled that "separate but equal" public education was unconstitutional because it could never be truly equal.

Marshall's arguments before the Supreme Court were myriad and historic. In total, Marshall won an unprecedented 29 out of the 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court.

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy appointed Marshall to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. On June 13, 1967, President Johnson appointed Marshall to the Supreme Court following the retirement of Justice Tom C. Clark. In appointing Marshall, President Johnson declared this was "the right thing to do, the right time to do it, the right man and the right place." He was the 96th person to hold the position, and the first African-American.

Today I stand before you, as many of my colleagues do, as a proud product of Thurgood Marshall's vision for equal access to education. Because of Thurgood Marshall's profound vision, one's access to education is no longer dependent upon the color of their skin or their income, but upon the demonstration of their academic promise, and scholarly merit and capability. Notwithstanding Marshall's legendary achievements in civil rights, America has much work to do. In thinking of our progress, I am reminded of the Bible in Jeremiah 8:20, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved." America has reaped the harvest of Marshall's life, Marshall's life is now past, and America has much work to do in civil rights. American people are not yet saved. The problem of this century, as it has been in past centuries, is still the problem of the color line. America has made great strides in this regard. Nonetheless, America still has work to do.

Although there are still some barriers to overcome, Thurgood Marshall removed the road block that stymied America from being as good as its promise. Thurgood Marshall also impacted the international community. Mr. Marshall was asked by the United Nations and the United Kingdom to help draft the constitutions of the emerging African nations of Ghana and what is now Tanzania. It was felt that the person who so successfully fought for the rights of America's oppressed minority would be the perfect person to ensure the rights of all African citizens, both Black and White, in these two former European colonies.

Being the right man or woman at the right time is no easy task. There is no room for passiveness or reluctance to action. Following in the tradition of the late Thurgood Marshall, we, the representatives of the United States citizenry, are the right people at the right time. Although our current battles differ slightly from those of Thurgood Marshall, we are faced with our own battles which include, the economy, creating affordable housing, immigration, Iraq, the pursuit of energy independence, and making sure that our veterans are properly taken care of.

The precedent that the late Thurgood Marshall set, in fighting to make the U.S. as great as its promise, should be our motivation to pass good legislation to protect the rights of American people as we honor and recognize his dedication and achievements on this 100th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing a true hero, Thurgood Marshall who died on January 24, 1993, at the age of 84. Let us honor his dedication and achievements as we recognize his contributions to the struggle for equal rights and justice in the United States.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their eloquent words, and I join them in urging the passage of this resolution recognizing a genuine American giant.

I yield back the balance of our time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 381.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING FLAGS ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1182) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that American flags flown on Federal Government buildings and on Federal property be made in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1182

Whereas, on June 14, 1777, the Stars and Stripes was officially adopted as the national flag of the United States;

Whereas Francis Scott Key was so inspired by the sight of the American flag still flying over Baltimore's Fort McHenry after a British bombardment that he wrote the "Star-Spangled Banner" on September 14, 1814;

Whereas the American flag has 7 red and 6 white horizontal stripes;

Whereas these stripes represent the 13 original States;

Whereas the flag still has its field of blue, which represents the Union and contains 50 stars, one for each State;

Whereas many brave men and women have fought and died for the freedoms that this flag represents; and

Whereas the sight of this banner brings feelings of joy, courage, pride, and unity for all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States House of Representatives that all American flags flown over Federal buildings be entirely produced in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, introduced by BOB FILNER of California, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, is both appropriate and timely. It expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that American flags flown on Federal Government buildings and on Federal property should be made in the United States.

As with many basic products sold in the U.S. today, it can be difficult to find a flag that is made in America. But the American flag is not just any product. It is our national symbol, and especially when it flies over Federal Government property, it ought to be made in America by Americans.

I am proud that the Architect of the Capitol flies only American-made flags. When one of our constituents or a community organization receives a flag flown over the Capitol, they can be sure it was made in the U.S.A.

When we see the American flag, it should remind us of American workers whose jobs are sometimes now being shipped overseas to countries with lower labor and worker safety protections. The American flag represents the values of our Nation, values that cannot be reconciled with the conditions in many overseas factories.

There is a lot we need to do to ensure that America retains the jobs that drive our economy. But as one step, if only a small symbolic step, let us assure the American people that we will not fly imported American flags over Federal property. The flags we fly will be made by American workers in American factories. They will never be made in foreign sweatshops or by children.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. And I want to commend the gentleman from California for introducing it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from California, and I do rise in support of House Resolution 1182, a sense of Congress that U.S. flags flown over Federal buildings should be made in the good old U.S.A.

The flag represents our unity and strength to the rest of the world, and it is only fitting that U.S. flags flown over Federal buildings be a product of our own country's labor and resources. Americans produce the best in the world when they put their minds to it, and it is entirely appropriate that the flag staffs on our Federal buildings be reserved for the best in the world, made right here in America.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Speaker and Chairman CONYERS for bringing H. Res. 1182 to the floor today. This important resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that all American flags flown over Federal Government buildings and on

Federal property should be made in the United States.

The U.S. Census bureau estimates that \$5.3 million worth of American flags were imported from other countries in 2006, mostly from China. Even though U.S. law requires every flag be labeled with its "country of origin," the figure of foreign-made American flags has steadily grown over the past few years. This is an absolute shame! I am glad that the office of the Architect of the Capitol has reassured me that flags that we fly everyday over this very Capitol are proudly made in the United States.

As we celebrated Independence Day last week, we were reminded that the American flag is much more than our national symbol. It embodies our courage, liberty, and justice. The flag reminds us each and every day of the blood that was shed so that we may enjoy our freedoms. So as we proudly fly the Stars and Stripes, we must ensure that they are homespun in the United States. I urge my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 1182.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1182 introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, Representative FILNER. This important legislation seeks to express the sense of the House of Representatives that American flags flown on Federal Government buildings and on Federal property be made in the United States.

On June 14, 1777, the Stars and Stripes were officially adopted as the national flag of the United States. Francis Scott Key was so inspired by the sight of the American flag still flying over Baltimore's Fort McHenry after a British bombardment that he wrote the "Star-Spangled Banner" on September 14, 1814. The American flag has 7 red and 6 white horizontal stripes; these stripes represent the 13 original States.

The flag still has its field of blue, which represents the Union and contains 50 stars, one for each State. Many brave men and women have fought and died for the freedom that this flag represents. The sight of this banner brings feelings of joy, courage, pride, and unity for all Americans. Therefore, it should be the sense of the United States House of Representatives that all American flags flown over Federal buildings be entirely produced in the United States.

For more than 200 years, the American flag has been the symbol of our Nation's strength and unity. It's been a source of pride and inspiration for millions of citizens. And the American Flag has been a prominent icon in our national history. On June 14, 1777, in order to establish an official flag for the new Nation, the Continental Congress passed the first Flag Act, "resolved that the flag of the United States be made of thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new Constellation."

Between 1777 and 1960, Congress passed several acts that changed the shape, design and arrangement of the flag and allowed for additional stars and stripes to be added to reflect the admission of each new state. Executive Order of President Eisenhower dated January 3, 1959—provided for the arrangement of the stars in seven rows of seven stars each, staggered horizontally and vertically. Executive Order of President Eisenhower dated August 21, 1959—provided for the arrangement of the

stars in nine rows of stars staggered horizontally and eleven rows of stars staggered vertically which made official the design of the flag that we know today.

Therefore, we should not reserve the right to make our Nation's flag at home, where blood was shed by brave men who had a vision for a free country rooted in democracy and justice. Although we may outsource many things, I support that we preserve the integrity of the symbol that serves as the very essence of our national anthem. This anthem serves to remind us of the United States flag, also known as the Star-Spangled Banner, which waves over the land of the free and the home of the brave. When we rise to pledge allegiance to our country, we place our hand over our beating heart; then we sing the delicate notes of the Star-Spangled Banner, but most of all we fix our gaze upon our Nation's flag. This time of reverence serves as a moment of introspection. Not until we fully come to grips with ourselves can we apply the wisdom that is needed to gather solutions for international issues.

Our Nation was founded upon the principles of liberty, equality and justice, which are reflected by the symbol of our Nation's flag. Therefore, I strongly support this powerful resolution that says that flags flown on Federal Government buildings and on Federal property be made in the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. GOHMERT. I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I join my colleague from Texas in urging support of this measure, and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1182.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION ON ITS 35TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 369) honoring the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 369

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) was created by an Executive order on July 6, 1973, and merged the previously separate law enforcement and intelligence agencies responsible for narcotics control;

Whereas the first administrator of the DEA, John R. Bartels, Jr., was confirmed by the Senate on October 4, 1973;

Whereas since 1973, the men and women of the DEA have served our Nation with courage, vision, and determination, protecting all Americans from the scourge of drug trafficking, drug abuse, and related violence;

Whereas the DEA has adjusted and refined the tactics and methods by which it targets the most dangerous drug trafficking operations to bring to justice criminals such as New York City's Nicky Barnes, key members of the infamous Colombian Medellin cartel, Thai warlord Khun Sa, several members of the Mexican Arellano-Felix organization, Afghan terrorist Haji Baz Mohammad, and international arms dealer Viktor Bout;

Whereas throughout its 35 years, the DEA has continually adapted to the evolving trends of drug trafficking organizations by aggressively targeting organizations involved in the growing, manufacturing, and distribution of such substances as marijuana, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, Ecstasy, and controlled prescription drugs;

Whereas in its 227 domestic offices in 21 field divisions, the DEA continues to strengthen and enhance existing relationships with Federal, State, and local counterparts in every State in the Union to combat drug trafficking;

Whereas in this decade alone, DEA special agents have seized over 5,500 kilograms of heroin; 650,000 kilograms of cocaine; 2,300,000 kilograms of marijuana; 13,000 kilograms of methamphetamine; almost 80,000,000 dosage units of hallucinogens; and made over 240,000 arrests;

Whereas in its 87 foreign offices in 63 countries, the DEA has the largest international presence of any Federal law enforcement agency;

Whereas its personnel continue to collaborate closely with international partners around the globe, including in such drug-producing countries as Colombia, Mexico, Afghanistan, and Thailand;

Whereas the results of this international collaboration in this decade alone have led to the indictments of 63 leaders, members, and associates of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, a designated foreign terrorist organization, as well as 144 arrests and detentions of narcotics traffickers for violations of Afghan and United States narcotics laws and terrorist-related offenses;

Whereas through the creation of the Diversion Control Program in 1971, the DEA now registers and regulates over 1,200,000 registrants, while simultaneously combating the continually-evolving threat posed by the diversion of controlled pharmaceuticals;

Whereas the DEA continues to hit drug traffickers financially, where it hurts the most, denying drug trafficking organizations \$3,500,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 alone, exceeding their 5-year goal of \$3,000,000,000 annually by fiscal year 2009;

Whereas DEA special agents continue to work shoulder-to-shoulder with Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials throughout the Nation in a cooperative effort to put drug traffickers behind bars;

Whereas throughout its history, many DEA employees and members of the agency's task forces have given their lives in the line of duty, including: Charles Archie Wood, Stafford E. Beckett, Joseph W. Floyd, Bert S. Gregory, James T. Williams, Louis L. Marks, James E. Brown, James R. Kerrigan, John W. Crozier, Spencer Stafford, Andrew P. Sanderson, Anker M. Bangs, Wilson M. Shee, Mansel R. Burrell, Hector Jordan, Gene A. Clifton, Frank Tummillo, Richard Heath, Jr., George F. White, Emir Benitez, Gerald Sawyer, Leslie S. Grosso, Nickolas Fragos, Mary M. Keehan, Charles H. Mann, Anna Y. Mounger, Anna J. Pope, Martha D. Skeels, Mary P. Sullivan, Larry D. Wallace,

Ralph N. Shaw, James T. Lunn, Octavio Gonzalez, Francis J. Miller, Robert C. Lightfoot, Thomas J. Devine, Larry N. Carwell, Marcellus Ward, Enrique S. Camarena, James A. Avant, Charles M. Bassing, Kevin L. Brosch, Susan M. Hoefler, William Ramos, Raymond J. Stastny, Arthur L. Cash, Terry W. McNett, George M. Montoya, Paul S. Seema, Everett E. Hatcher, Rickie C. Finley, Joseph T. Aversa, Wallie Howard, Jr., Eugene T. McCarthy, Alan H. Winn, George D. Althouse, Becky L. Dwojeski, Stephen J. Strehl, Juan C. Vars, Jay W. Seale, Meredith Thompson, Frank S. Wallace, Jr., Frank Fernandez, Jr., Kenneth G. McCullough, Carrol June Fields, Rona L. Chafey, Shelly D. Bland, Carrie A. Lenz, Shaun E. Curl, Royce D. Tramel, Alice Faye Hall-Walton, Elton Armstead, Larry Steilen, Terry Loftus, Jay Balchunas, and Richard E. Fass;

Whereas many other DEA employees and task force officers have been wounded or injured in the line of duty; and

Whereas over 9,000 employees of the DEA, including special agents, intelligence analysts, diversion investigators, program analysts, forensic chemists, attorneys, and administrative support, along with over 2,000 task force officers, and over 2,000 vetted foreign officers, work tirelessly to hunt down and bring to justice the drug trafficking cartels that seek to poison our citizens with dangerous narcotics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) congratulates the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) on the occasion of its 35th anniversary;

(2) honors the heroic sacrifice of the agency's employees who have given their lives or have been wounded or injured in service of our Nation; and

(3) gives heartfelt thanks to all the men and women of the DEA for their past and continued efforts to defend the American people from the scourge of illegal drugs and terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the brave men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 35th anniversary. The DEA's employees include not only the special agents, but intelligence analysts, diversion investigators, program analysts, forensic chemists, attorneys and administrative support staff, together with task force officers and vetted foreign officials. These men and women work tirelessly to hunt down and bring to justice the drug trafficking cartels that profit by poisoning our citizens with dangerous narcotics.

The DEA and its dedicated officers have served our Nation with courage,

vision and determination, protecting all Americans from the scourge of drug trafficking, drug abuse and related violence. It is fitting that we recognize their accomplishments and express our gratitude for their service.

Throughout its 35 years, the DEA has combated the evolving trends of drug trafficking by aggressively targeting both domestic and international organizations involved in the unlawful growing, manufacturing and distribution of such substances as marijuana, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, Ecstasy and controlled prescription drugs. These successes are unfortunately not without tragic costs.

Over its history, more than 75 DEA employees and task force members have given their lives in the line of duty, with many others wounded. During the time I served with the U.S. Attorney's Office in Los Angeles, I had many, many occasions to work with DEA officers. I saw the professionalism of their work, their determination, their bravery and courage.

For some time I worked on the investigation into the capture, murder and torture of Enrique Camarena and, along with my colleagues, worked to investigate and bring to justice some of those that were responsible for the death of that courageous agent. So I have great personal regard for the many employees of the DEA, their proud history and the great work they do.

It is a commitment to duty almost too great to ask of anyone, yet these dedicated men and women of the DEA and their families face the risks and endure the hardships to make our Nation safer for all of us.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a well-deserved tribute to the DEA on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 369. This concurrent resolution does honor the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

The Drug Enforcement Administration, or DEA, was created by President Nixon in July 1973. The DEA was established to create a single unified command to conduct "an all-out global war on the drug menace."

The DEA has the core mission to enforce U.S. controlled substances laws that regulate drugs such as marijuana, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, Ecstasy and controlled prescription drugs. Initially, the DEA had 1,470 special agents and a budget of less than \$75 million. Its foreign presence consisted of 43 foreign offices in 31 countries. Since that time the DEA has grown substantially and is now 5,235 special agents, a budget of more than \$2.3 billion, and 87 foreign offices in 63 countries.

I have personally seen them at work, both here and abroad, and know that

the DEA agents are on the front lines of our war on drugs. They are courageous individuals, and they are to be honored and commended.

DEA special agents work to track and identify the individuals and organized crime syndicates that grow, manufacture and traffic drugs into the U.S. To accomplish that mission, the DEA manages a national drug intelligence program by cooperating with Federal, State, local and foreign officials to collect, analyze and disseminate strategic and operational drug intelligence information. The DEA and its multi-jurisdictional partners form task forces that use this intelligence to plan highly successful operations.

In May, a DEA-led task force completed an investigation called "Operation Sudden Fall" in San Diego. This investigation resulted in the arrest of 96 individuals, including 75 San Diego State University students who were involved with the trafficking of cocaine, marijuana and Ecstasy on the university's campus.

As the plague of drugs has become more pervasive, the DEA has also increased its international efforts to combat drug trafficking abroad. The DEA coordinates with the United Nations, Interpol and foreign governments to develop programs designed to reduce the availability of illicit drugs in the United States such as crop eradication, crop substitution and training of foreign officials.

□ 1615

These international efforts bring significant results. Recently, Colombia extradited 14 members of a paramilitary and drug trafficking group to the United States to face charges of drug trafficking, support to a terrorist organization, and money laundering.

In June, the DEA worked with partners in Afghanistan to conduct Operation Albatross. This effort resulted in the seizure of 262 tons of hashish, the largest of any known drug seizure in history.

As H. Con. Res. 369 notes, in this decade alone, DEA agents have seized over 5,500 kilograms of heroin, 650,000 kilograms of cocaine, 2.3 million kilograms of marijuana, 13,000 kilograms of methamphetamine, almost 80 million dosage units of hallucinogens, and made over 240,000 arrests. This is a tremendous amount of poison that they have prevented from entering our fellow citizens.

In supporting this resolution, I join my colleagues in, one, congratulating the DEA on the occasion of its 35th anniversary; two, honoring the heroic sacrifice of the agency's employees who have given their lives or have been wounded or injured in service of our Nation; and three, giving heartfelt thanks to all of the men and women of the DEA for their past and continued efforts to defend the American people from the scourge of illegal drugs and terrorism.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of their 35th anniversary. We must take every opportunity to honor our brave law enforcement officers, but we often forget the critical importance of the DEA and the terrible dangers that their officers face in order to keep our streets safe from drugs. When you look at the list of those who have given their lives, Mr. Speaker, we know how serious this is. And we have this issue occur on our streets every day.

I want to congratulate the DEA acting administrator, Michele M. Leonhart, for leading this commendable agency through its 35th year. I want to give great thanks to Gerald McAleer, Special Agent in charge of the DEA New Jersey division, for all of the tremendous work he's done to team with local law enforcement in order to provide the most effective level of security against drugs in our neighborhoods.

Just 3 days ago, the DEA in New Jersey teamed with Passaic County Prosecutor James F. Avigliano to arrest six individuals affiliated with the Trey 9 set of the Bloods street gang who were peddling large quantities of drugs in Newark, Parsippany, and in my town of Paterson, New Jersey. These arrests were executed as part of New Jersey Governor Jon Corzine's Crime Initiative to target criminal gangs, drugs, and guns.

This particular 35-day investigation was initiated by the prosecutor's office of gang/narcotics task force, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the United States Postal Office, and the Clifton Police Department, proving once again that our greatest level of homeland security can only come from Federal, State, and local enforcement agencies working in this partnership.

In regards to the DEA's efforts in this high-profile drug bust, I can provide no greater testament to the urgency of the work than by quoting Prosecutor James Avigliano who stated this: "Without the outstanding cooperation with the DEA Newark office, we would have been unable to arrest six major gang leaders and confiscate a substantial quantity of narcotics. The assistance provided by the DEA is key to our continued success in taking high level dealers and large quantities of drugs off the street."

It is due to the critical nature of their work that I am very thankful that we saw fit to approve much-needed funding of the DEA in last year's Consolidated Appropriations Act that put 200 more agents on the street after having to endure a long hiring freeze in previous years. No justification for that whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. We must do more to honor the DEA and I pledge my full support.

Mr. Speaker, let me plead with you and my fellow Members on both sides of the aisle that there is no greater threat to the United States of America than the undermining of our will and our morale with the issuing of drugs through proliferation through our streets. There is no greater danger, Mr. Speaker. I cannot say it enough. The DEA understands that. Hopefully the Congress will come to understand it as well.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no other speakers.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support and recognition of House Resolution 369 honoring the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 35th anniversary.

For the last 35 years, the men and women of the DEA have served their country with distinction and honor while fighting one of the most dangerous problems this country faces today. Drug use and the violence associated with drug trafficking touches every American's life in some way or another. The men and women of the DEA are working tirelessly every day to prevent drugs from coming into the United States and to prevent or dismantle the manufacturing and distribution of drugs within our borders. This is no easy task.

The DEA consistently adapts to changes in the drug trade. From dismantling illegal Internet pharmacies to identifying new trends in manufacturing and distribution, the DEA is and must be at the top of their game. Because the DEA has the greatest presence overseas of any Federal law enforcement agency, diplomacy and collaboration with the leadership of drug-producing countries, like Colombia, is essential for their efforts to be effective. The men and women of the DEA are up to the challenge.

The over 9,000 employees of the DEA are an asset to the country, and I'm proud to honor them every day. They are in very dangerous places putting their lives on the line every day. I want to thank them for their dedication and their commitment to the agency and our country. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. GOHMERT. With that, Mr. Speaker, we would urge our colleagues to join us in this resolution's support.

My friend from Ohio will be managing the next two bills, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act, and the one to follow. Before I finish yielding back my time, I would like to express my thanks to my friend from California, the chairman of the Judiciary

Committee, the ranking member of Judiciary, as well as our chairman in Crime, BOBBY SCOTT, on the Debbie Smith reauthorization. I will not be here to be able to speak on that, but I am so grateful we were able to keep that from being overly burdened with things that would keep it from achieving its goal which, here again, helps everybody, including the DEA agents, when we do that job properly. I'm so grateful that we're going to be able to take that up and get that done today.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, just to conclude on the legislation recognizing the 35th anniversary of the DEA, I recall very well the loss of two DEA agents in the City of San Marino, very close to my district, back when I was with the U.S. Attorney. They were involved in a buy-bust. It was a small amount of drugs, a small amount of money, I think amounting to some \$35,000. These two agents, one was killed in a shoot-out with the drug dealers, the other shot at point-blank range execution style when these young drug dealers decided they would rather keep the \$35,000 and kill two people for it.

This is the kind of risk the DEA agents face every day. We're extraordinarily grateful to have such courageous men and women working within the agency. I urge the passage of the recognition bill.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 369, honoring the men and women of the United States Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 35th Anniversary.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to visit the DEA's training facility in Quantico, Virginia.

This training facility is designed to prepare local law enforcement agents to deal with the specific hazards surrounding small, clandestine methamphetamine labs. More than 100 law enforcement officers from my home state of Nebraska have taken part in the training.

We also had the opportunity to speak briefly with agent trainees at the DEA training facility.

I truly appreciate these men and women who are battling against the evil of illegal drugs in the heartland of Nebraska and throughout our country.

These individuals—both the agents on the street and their instructors—deserve commendation for their dedication and sacrifice.

Through public education, vigilance, and the efforts of law enforcement, we can curb the spread of dangerous drugs in our communities.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 369.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5057) to reauthorize the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5057

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2008”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DEBBIE SMITH DNA BACKLOG GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) To carry out, for inclusion in such Combined DNA Index System, DNA analyses of samples from missing or unidentified persons, including samples from the remains, personal effects, or biological relatives of such persons.”;

(C) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking “paragraph (1) or (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), or (3)”;

(D) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “in paragraph (1)” and inserting “in paragraphs (1) and (3)”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) provide assurances that the State or unit of local government has implemented, or will implement not later than 2 years after the date of such application, a process under which the State or unit, respectively, provides for the collection, for purposes of inclusion in the Combined DNA Index System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of DNA samples from all felons who are imprisoned in a prison of such State or unit, respectively, (including all felons imprisoned in such prison or unit, respectively, as of the date of the enactment of the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2008).”;

(3) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (D);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (A); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) For each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014, not less than 40 percent of the grant amounts shall be awarded for purposes under subsection (a)(2) of this section.”; and

(4) by amending subsection (j) to read as follows:

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for grants under subsection (a)—

“(1) \$151,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

“(2) \$200,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall

apply to grants made on or after January 1, 2009.

SEC. 3. STUDY TO ASSESS THE DNA ANALYSIS BACKLOG.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) despite the funding provided for more than 5 fiscal years by the Federal Government to assist in the reduction of the DNA analysis backlog, the backlog continues to exist in many crime laboratories around the country;

(2) as a consequence of the continuance of the DNA analysis backlog, many violent crimes that could be solved remain unsolved, and individuals who have been wrongfully convicted who could be determined to be innocent through DNA testing remain in prison; and

(3) the causes of the DNA analysis backlog are complex and require a thorough and detailed study.

(b) STUDY REQUIRED.—The National Academy of Sciences shall, in consultation with no fewer than 3 forensic science practitioners from States and units of local government, conduct a study to determine the resources and other requirements necessary to eliminate the DNA analysis backlog and to prevent such a backlog from reoccurring after it has been eliminated.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to the Attorney General and to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.

SEC. 4. INCENTIVES FOR PERMANENT STATE-GENERATED DNA FUNDING STREAMS.

(a) MATCHING FUNDS.—For each fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, each eligible DNA funding State, with respect to a funding mechanism described in subsection (b) implemented by such State, shall be eligible for Federal matching funds to carry out such mechanism in an amount determined to be appropriate by the Attorney General.

(b) ELIGIBLE DNA FUNDING STATES DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this section, the term “eligible DNA funding State” means a State that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the State has implemented (and applies) a permanent funding mechanism that generates funds, whether by fees or penalties, that are allocated by the State only for purposes of the analysis of DNA samples for law enforcement purposes.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

SEC. 5. EVALUATION OF DNA INTEGRITY AND SECURITY.

(a) EVALUATION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall evaluate the integrity and security of DNA collection and storage practices and procedures at a sample of crime laboratories in the United States to determine the extent to which DNA samples are tampered with or are otherwise contaminated in crime laboratories. Such sample shall be a representative sample of crime laboratories in the United States.

(b) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall annually report to Congress the findings of the evaluation conducted under subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 6. INCENTIVES FOR STATES TO COLLECT DNA SAMPLES FROM INDIVIDUALS ARRESTED FOR OR CHARGED WITH MURDER AND SEX CRIMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State that receives funds for a fiscal year under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and that has an implemented enhanced State DNA collection process for such year, the amount of funds that would otherwise be allocated for that fiscal year to the State under such subpart shall be increased by 10 percent.

(b) ENHANCED STATE DNA COLLECTION PROCESS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “enhanced State DNA collection process” means, with respect to a State, a process under which the State provides for the collection, for purposes of inclusion in the Combined DNA Index System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of DNA samples from the following individuals who are at least 18 years of age:

(1) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that consists of murder or voluntary manslaughter or any attempt to commit murder or voluntary manslaughter.

(2) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that has an element involving a sexual act or sexual contact with another and that is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year, or an attempt to commit such an offense.

(3) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that consists of a specified offense against a minor (as defined in section 111(7) of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911(7))), or an attempt to commit such an offense.

The expungement requirements under section 210304(d) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(d)) shall apply to any samples collected pursuant to this section for purposes of inclusion in the Combined DNA Index System.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall apply to grants made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to funds made available under section 508 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3758), such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL STUDY AND REPORT ON INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTIONS RELATED TO CODIS “HITS”.

(a) STUDY.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall carry out a study on—

(1) the number of instances in which DNA samples that are matched with samples included in the Combined DNA Index System database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that are followed up on by appropriate law enforcement entities;

(2) the number of such matches described in paragraph (1) that are brought to the attention of a prosecutor;

(3) the number of the investigations described in paragraph (2) that result in a trial; and

(4) in the case of matches described in paragraph (1) that were not followed up on by appropriate law enforcement entities, were not brought to the attention of a prosecutor, or did not result in a trial—

(A) the reasons why such matches were not pursued accordingly; and

(B) the resulting impact on the criminal justice system, including whether other

crimes were committed that could have been prevented if such matches had been pursued accordingly.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall submit to Congress a report on the study under subsection (a).

SEC. 8. NATIONAL DNA INDEX SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Attorney General shall establish the National DNA Index System Advisory Board (in this section referred to as the “NDIS Advisory Board”) to develop and, if appropriate, periodically revise standards and requirements for the use of and access to the index described in section 210304(a) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(a)).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall appoint members to the NDIS Advisory Board as follows:

(1) At least 4 directors of State or local forensic laboratories.

(2) One representative from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) One representative from the Scientific Working Group on DNA Analysis Methods.

(4) One representative from the Office of Legal Policy of the Department of Justice.

(5) One representative from the National Institute of Justice.

(6) One representative from the National Academies of Science.

(7) One State or local prosecutor.

(8) One criminal defense attorney.

(9) One representative from the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(10) One member of the academic community who specializes in DNA privacy issues.

(11) One crime victim or crime victim advocate.

(12) One representative of a State police agency.

(13) One representative of a local police agency.

(c) **APPLICATION OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), other than section 14 of such Act, shall apply to the NDIS Advisory Board.

(d) **NOTICE, COMMENT, AND PUBLICATION.**—The Attorney General shall provide for public notice and comment for each standard developed under this section and for publication of each such standard.

(e) **PAY AND REIMBURSEMENT.**—

(1) **NO COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF NDIS ADVISORY BOARD.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member of the NDIS Advisory Board may not receive pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Board.

(2) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) **QUALITY ASSURANCE STANDARDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the NDIS Advisory Board shall develop (and provide recommendations to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on) standards governing the use of and access to the index described in subsection (a). The NDIS Advisory Board shall periodically update such standards as appropriate. The standards shall provide for the expedited uploading into such index by State and local forensic laboratories of DNA analyses of samples obtained from persons convicted of crimes, including such analyses processed by private forensic laboratories.

(2) **CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS TO EXPEDITE PROCESSING AND UPLOADING OF DNA SAMPLES.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the NDIS Advisory Board shall also

provide recommendations to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the following:

(A) The feasibility and desirability of entering into agreements with private forensic laboratories to enable direct access to the Combined DNA Index System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purpose of uploading DNA analyses of samples obtained from persons convicted of crimes.

(B) The feasibility and desirability of providing for more limited technical review audits of DNA analyses of samples prior to uploading such data into the Combined DNA Index System.

(C) The feasibility and desirability of permitting greater participation in the technical review of DNA analyses of samples by contractor personnel.

(D) The feasibility and desirability of allowing immediate upload of DNA profiles obtained from crime scene samples and rape kits.

(3) **ISSUANCE OF POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS.**—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the approval of the Attorney General, after taking into consideration the recommended policies, procedures, and standards recommended by the NDIS Advisory Board under this section shall issue (and revise from time to time) policies, procedures, and standards relating to the administration of the National DNA Index System including, standards for quality assurance, testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories, and forensic analysts, in conducting analyses of DNA.

(g) **EXCLUSIVITY OF POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS.**—The policies, procedures, and standards issued under subsection (f)(3) shall be the exclusive policies, procedures, and standards issued with respect to State, local, and private laboratories that participate in the National DNA Index System. Policies, procedures, laboratory audit requirements, standards, and any other manner of regulation or control (other than any condition imposed pursuant to a grant awarded through the Department of Justice) may not be inconsistent with, or expand upon provisions contained in such approved policies, procedures, or standards.

SEC. 9. DNA TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General shall establish a grant program under which the Attorney General may make grants to States and units of local government to purchase forensic DNA technology or to improve such technology.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 10. REAUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN DNA-RELATED GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) **DNA TRAINING AND EDUCATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT, CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL, AND COURT OFFICERS.**—Section 303(b) of the Justice For All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136(b)) is amended by striking “2009” and inserting “2014”.

(b) **SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM PROGRAM GRANTS.**—Section 304(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 14136a(c)) is amended by striking “2009” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **DNA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 305(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 14136b(c)) is amended by striking “2009” and inserting “2014”.

(d) **DNA IDENTIFICATION OF MISSING PERSONS.**—Section 308(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 14136d(c)) is amended by striking “2009” and inserting “2014”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5057, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2008, authorizes the Attorney General to provide grants to States to assist them in reducing the enormous DNA evidence backlog in the Nation's laboratories. This important legislation will help to solve more crimes. It will help to solve more crimes more quickly, and perhaps most importantly, it will help to ensure that other crimes are prevented altogether.

Across our Nation, law enforcement officers and prosecutors have come to recognize the role that DNA evidence can play in solving crimes. As a result, ever-increasing numbers of DNA samples are being collected from crime scenes and offenders. There is no better example that demonstrates the effectiveness of DNA technology in solving crimes than that of Debbie Smith, the bill's namesake.

In 1989, Ms. Smith was kidnapped in her Virginia home and viciously attacked by a stranger who threatened her life should she report the attack. Nevertheless, with remarkable courage and determination, she reported the rape, and the crime lab preserved the DNA evidence of her attacker. Eventually, when the perpetrator was required to provide a DNA sample for a separate violent crime he was convicted for, a match was made to the sample collected from his attack on Ms. Smith, identifying him as her attacker.

Mr. Speaker, Debbie Smith and her husband, Rob, are here with us today, and I would like to ask them to stand so we can not only acknowledge their presence but thank them for their courage and determination and their work which has served as the driving force behind this legislation.

The remarkable law enforcement value of DNA evidence has unfortunately been limited by the enormous backlog of DNA samples still awaiting analysis. This means that crimes remain unsolved, violent offenders remain at large, and innocent individuals may be wrongfully imprisoned. H.R. 5057 would significantly increase the funding levels authorized for this important program and would also provide for important studies to further improve the system. H.R. 5057 also includes a number of other important initiatives that were adopted during the committee process.

Beginning in the 1990s, the Nation's crime labs were largely unprepared for the onslaught of requests for DNA services. Samples continue to pour into our Nation's crime labs at a pace faster than they can be processed. In order to address backlog problems, many States have begun outsourcing some of the work to accredited private laboratories. However, the FBI requires the crime labs perform in-house technical reviews of 100 percent of database samples from contract labs. While this requirement is certainly important with regard to forensic casework samples, it is found to be an onerous requirement with regard to the rather simple swabs that are taken from convicted offenders.

□ 1630

In fact, these requirements add substantial additional costs and further delay backlog reduction. Indeed, even Debbie Smith grant funds are expended on fulfilling these onerous requirements.

The National Institute of Justice has confirmed that "the burden of these requirements has increased the backlog of convicted offender samples, cost millions of dollars, and forced crime laboratories to remove staff from analyzing rape kits and other forensic samples."

In order to address this issue, I offered a bipartisan provision with my colleague Representative Dan Lungren that would create a new National DNA Index System Advisory Board to ensure diverse representation of views, including State and local lab directors, officials from the FBI and DOJ, and other relevant stakeholders.

The board is directed to develop new standards governing the use of the Federal index that provide for the expedited uploading by State and local forensic labs of convicted offender profiles generated by private labs. These new standards are to be issued within 6 months.

In addition, the board is directed to look into the feasibility of other measures that would greatly expedite analysis and uploading, as well as backlog reduction. These include the feasibility and desirability of entering into agreements with private forensic labs to enable direct access to CODIS for the purpose of uploading DNA analyses of samples obtained from persons convicted of crimes; the feasibility and desirability of providing for more limited technical review audits of DNA analyses of samples prior to uploading such data into CODIS; and the feasibility and desirability permitting greater participation in the technical review process of contractor personnel.

I also authored another provision in this legislation that aims to increase the crime-solving abilities of our DNA databases.

Today, 12 States collect samples from murder and sex crime arrestees, including my home State of California. Four of these States, including California,

collect or are preparing to collect samples from all felony arrestees.

Virginia was the first State to expand its database to include arrestees, and since then, the State has seen a total of 398 hits to their arrestee database, 74 of which were associated with sexual assault cases. For the first two months of this year alone, six hits to arrestees were made, the first hit coming just after the upload of the first 80 samples into the database.

A 2005 Chicago study examined the criminal activities of only eight individuals and found that 60 violent crimes could have been prevented, including 53 murders and rapes, if DNA was required for felony arrests.

In one example, Andre Crawford was charged with 11 murders and one attempted murder/aggravated sexual assault. If the State had required him to give a DNA sample during an earlier felony arrest, the subsequent 10 murders and one rape would not have occurred.

In another example, Mario Villa was charged with four rapes, linked by DNA to two other rapes, and a main suspect in an additional rape and two attempted rapes. If the State had required him to give a DNA sample during an earlier felony arrest, eight rapes or attempted rapes could have been prevented.

A recent Maryland study looked at the criminal histories for three offenders and found that 20 crimes, including rapes, sexual assaults, and murder could have been prevented had their DNA samples been required upon arrest.

Mr. Speaker, States who have moved to collect arrestee samples, such as Virginia and California, are greatly increasing the power of the national DNA network, while States with far narrower collection regimes are making the Federal database, which Congress has invested a substantial amount of money in, less sufficient. These States can still avail themselves of the Federal database and take full advantage of the expansive collection regimes of other States.

Therefore, a provision of this bill would provide incentives for States to follow the lead of the 12 States that currently collect samples from individuals arrested for or charged with murder and sex crimes. These States who would enact such an enhanced collection process would be eligible for a 10 percent increase in Federal formula law enforcement funds.

Since State backlogs are so huge and Federal funds remain limited, States have had to share a significant portion of the burden to fund these activities. However, State funding can fluctuate from year-to-year given the budget process and competing priorities. Some States, such as California, have penalty fee structures in place that provide a more stable and consistent funding stream.

Proposition 69 in California provided for a \$1 penalty for every \$10 or frac-

tion thereof upon every fine, penalty and forfeiture levied on criminal offenses, including traffic expenses, but excluding parking. Over \$40 million has been raised in California since its inception, and this has taken some of the burden off the Federal Government and the Debbie Smith grant funds available each year.

States should be encouraged to put such structures in place and for their ability to not rely as heavily on Federal resources.

Therefore, I authored a provision in this bill that would authorize the Attorney General to provide matching funds to those States that have implemented permanent funding mechanisms that generate funds, whether by fees or penalties, that are allocated by the State only for the purpose of analyzing DNA samples for law enforcement purposes.

Finally, this legislation includes a separate grant authorization for upgrading laboratory capability and infrastructure. And it provides supplemental grant incentives for States to fund their own DNA initiatives.

We have a comprehensive bill that will give lawmakers the best information for formulating policy, as well as provide law enforcement the most up-to-date tools and technology for solving crimes.

I'd like to commend CAROLYN MALONEY of New York for her leadership in authoring this bill. I also want to thank Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH of Texas, as well as Subcommittee Chairman BOBBY SCOTT and Ranking Member LOUIE GOHMERT for their leadership in making this a fully bipartisan effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) in support of H.R. 5057, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY introduced this legislation to reauthorize the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Elimination Grant Program through fiscal year 2014 at \$151 million per year.

DNA has become an invaluable tool in identifying and convicting criminal suspects. At the same time, the increased use of DNA evidence in criminal prosecutions has also increased DNA collection and processing requests. The result is a substantial backlog in processing DNA evidence across the country.

The Debbie Smith program provides grants to State and local governments to reduce the DNA backlog of samples collected and entered into the national DNA database. The program, originally authorized in 2000, expires at the end of fiscal year 2009.

Since 2000, DNA backlog grants have assisted State and local governments with the collection of 2.5 million DNA samples from convicted offenders and

arrestees for inclusion in the national DNA database. The backlog grants have also funded the testing of approximately 104,000 DNA cases between 2004 and 2007.

While the Debbie Smith Program has indeed been successful in reducing the backlog, there is still work to do. A 2003 Department of Justice report indicated a backlog of 48,000 DNA samples. The current backlog is expected to be just as high.

Mr. Speaker, every 2.7 minutes a person becomes a victim of sexual assault in this country. That's 22 Americans every hour, 528 every day, and over 3,600 every week who are the victims of rape or sexual assault. Debbie Smith was one of these victims, and it took 6 years before her assailant was identified through DNA evidence.

I also would like to commend Debbie Smith and her family for their courage and determination to help others who may become victims and also to prevent others from becoming victims in the future. It's very commendable for her and very brave of her and her family to step forward and go through what they have gone through.

There is another aspect of this bill that I would also like to highlight, and that is the expansion of the grant program to locate and identify missing persons and human remains. There are estimated to be more than 40,000 sets of unidentified human remains just, oftentimes, literally sitting on the shelves in medical examiner offices or in law enforcement offices or in coroner offices around the country. These cases have been put at the bottom of the list far too often, while most recent cases are investigated and solved using DNA technology. Yet, many of the 40,000 are also victims of heinous crimes.

For example in 1996, a woman who became a very good friend of myself and the staff people in my office, Debbie Culberson, her daughter Carrie died a gruesome death. While the murderer was convicted and will serve the rest of his life in jail, Carrie has never been found. Evidence has led investigators to the Ohio River, which divides the States of Ohio and Kentucky, but we don't know for sure.

Grants such as those made available by H.R. 5057 will ensure that law enforcement nationwide have the resources to make identifying these human remains a priority as well.

Congress has a responsibility to assist States with investigating, prosecuting, and severely punishing those who commit rapes and other sexual offenses and provide justice for victims. The Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act protects victims by providing Federal funding to process the DNA evidence needed to take violent criminals off the streets.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the gen-

tlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for 4 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and the manager of the minority side, as well as the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS; the ranking member, Mr. SMITH; the subcommittee Chair, Mr. SCOTT; and the ranking member, Mr. GOHMERT.

As a member of the subcommittee on crime and a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I rise with great enthusiasm to support H.R. 5057, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2008.

And I salute Mr. and Mrs. Smith. This is not a new bill to me. Congresswoman MALONEY has worked very hard and has engaged the many women of the Congress to look at this issue in many, many different ways. We thank you, Debbie Smith for your courage, and we thank you for your bravery.

This is an important initiative. There are many improvements that have made this bill even better, but had it not been for Debbie Smith and her courage, we would not be where we are today.

As my colleague has already said, this bill was named for Debbie Smith who was kidnapped in her Virginia home and raped by a stranger. The Debbie Smith DNA backlog grant bill authorized grant money to States to collect samples from crime scenes and convicted persons.

This legislation also allows us to conduct DNA analysis and enter these results into a comprehensive national database. Debbie Smith's attacker remained unidentified for over 6 years, until a DNA sample collected from a convicted person serving time in Virginia State prison revealed his involvement in her rape. Although eventually identified, the 6 years between crime and identification allowed Ms. Smith's attacker to engage in more criminal activity.

What is the purpose and value of this legislation? It is to ensure that the perpetrator, the person who has acted in a violent and heinous way, is tried and convicted in a direct and fair and just manner, and that this individual is taken off the streets in order not to harm anyone else.

I am very gratified that we have expanded this legislation and that it is also an opportunity not only to ensure that those who have committed the crime are "doing the time" but to make sure that DNA is accurate and untainted for a fair and just results.

I support this legislation, and therefore, I offered a successful amendment that would require the Attorney General to evaluate the integrity and security of DNA collection and storage practices and procedures at a sample of crime laboratories throughout the country to determine the extent to which DNA samples are tampered with or are otherwise contaminated in such laboratories. This is crucial. A person

who should be convicted and is still walking the streets, can create more danger, and those who have been tried and incarcerated on contaminated DNA deserve a fair and just recommendation of their case. Contaminated DNA helps no one and this amendment corrects that problem.

The sample should be a representative sample and should include at least one lab from each State. My amendment would require the Attorney General to conduct this evaluation annually, and the Attorney General would be required to submit the evaluation to Congress. This amendment is necessary, and it authorizes some \$10 million over a 5-year period to allow this process to occur.

In Harris County, Texas, and other places around the Nation, DNA evidence was contaminated and wrongfully used to convict persons based upon faulty evidence. An investigation into the crime lab in Houston, for example, revealed that bad management, undertrained staff, false documentation, and inaccurate work cast doubt on thousands of DNA-based convictions. Investigators raised serious questions about the reliability of evidence in hundreds of cases they investigated and asked for further independent scrutiny and new testing to determine the extent to which individuals were wrongly convicted with faulty evidence.

Two individuals, Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Joshua Sutton, were victimized by this faulty DNA process. Both served time in jail and were released when their cases were properly reviewed.

□ 1645

This is evidence that my amendment helps an already good bill, which will help victims like Mrs. Smith, but it also provides the added integrity to this system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. I would be happy to yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. My amendment ensures that Congress will exercise the appropriate oversight over the DNA Data Collection Program. It will ensure the integrity and security of the DNA collection and storage procedures. It is my hope that my amendment will minimize wrongful convictions and will make the DNA storage and collection process more reliable.

When such a sacrifice has been made by someone as brave as Mrs. Smith, along with the work that has been done by my colleague, Congresswoman MALONEY, and this Congress, it further enhances the Nation's criminal justice system. We all agree, the criminal justice system should convict those who have done these dastardly acts, incarcerate them through a fair process of justice. And then, those who are innocent, make sure that the criminal justice system has the tools to insure them not guilty through transparent DNA evidence.

This is the way the American's justice system should be. We want this open fair system as much for Harris County, Texas, as we want it for Los Angeles, Chicago, and other places around the Nation.

This bill is a bill of integrity and fairness, and it upholds the fair justice system of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, this act authorizes funding to eliminate the large backlogs of DNA crime scene samples awaiting testing in State forensic labs. I am in support of this bill.

In recent years, law enforcement agencies have realized the critical value that DNA evidence has in quickly solving cases. Often, a DNA sample result can scientifically link a perpetrator to a crime or prove a defendant's innocence with virtual certainty. Many of the Nation's Federal and State criminal forensics laboratories currently are overwhelmed with innumerable samples awaiting DNA analysis.

Named for Debbie Smith, who was kidnapped in her Virginia home and raped by a stranger, the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program authorized grant money to States to collect samples from crime scenes and convicted persons, conduct DNA analyses, and enter these results into a comprehensive national database. Debbie Smith's attacker remained unidentified for over six years, until a DNA sample collected from a convicted person serving time in a Virginia State prison revealed his involvement in her rape. Although eventually identified, the six years between crime and identification allowed Ms. Smith's attacker to engage in more criminal activity.

Reauthorization of the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program will help law enforcement throughout the Nation. It will facilitate the development of a comprehensive national data base against which samples from current crime scenes can be compared. It will allow laboratories to reduce the currently unacceptable delays in processing DNA samples. Finally, it will provide law enforcement and prosecutors strong tools to quickly identify and prosecute criminals, minimizing the costs of investigation and prosecution, the possibility of prosecuting the wrong person and the possibility of future heinous crimes.

Recognizing that the backlog of biological evidence that had to be entered in State databases was preventing law enforcement officials from solving many of the Nation's most heinous crimes, like the tragedy that befell Debbie Smith, Congress passed the DNA "Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000" (P.L. 106-546). The bill authorized the Attorney General to make grants to eligible States to collect DNA samples from convicted individuals and crime scenes for inclusion in the Federal DNA database, Combined DNA Index System (CODIS), and to increase the capacity of State crime laboratories. The act required the Bureau of Prisons and the military to collect DNA samples from convicted individuals and forward these samples for analysis, and required the FBI to expand its CODIS database to include the analyses of these DNA samples.

The act also amended the criminal code to require all defendants on probation or supervised release to cooperate with the collection of a DNA sample. The act expressed the sense of Congress that State grants should be

conditioned upon the State's agreement to ensure post-conviction DNA testing in appropriate cases; and that Congress should work with the States to improve the quality of legal representation in capital cases. Finally, the act authorized an unspecified amount of appropriations to the Attorney General to carry out the act.

In 2004, DNA backlog elimination was incorporated into the Justice for All Act of 2004", P.L. 108-405 and was renamed the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, which became Title II of P.L. 108-405. While the act authorized \$151 million for each fiscal year 2005-2009, Congress did not appropriate any money until FY 2008, at which time it appropriated \$147.4 million.

The Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program expires at the end of FY 2009. H.R. 5057, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act," which has strong bipartisan support, would renew the law and authorize \$151 million for each fiscal year 2009-2014. H.R. 5057 specifies that not less than 40 percent of the total amount awarded in grants must be used for DNA analyses of samples from crime scenes, rape kits and other sexual assault evidence, and in cases that do not have an identified suspect.

AMENDMENT

While I support this legislation, I successfully offered an amendment at subcommittee markup. My amendment would require the Attorney General to evaluate the integrity and security of DNA collection and storage practices and procedures at a sample of crime laboratories throughout the country to determine the extent to which DNA samples are tampered with or are otherwise contaminated in such laboratories. The sample should be a representative sample and should include at least one lab from each State. My amendment would require the Attorney General to conduct this evaluation annually and the Attorney General should be required to submit the evaluation to Congress. This amendment is necessary.

In Harris County, Texas, DNA evidence was tainted and wrongfully used to convict persons based upon faulty evidence. An investigation into the crime lab in Houston revealed that bad management, under-trained staff, false documentation, and inaccurate work cast doubt on thousands of DNA based convictions. Investigators raised serious questions about the reliability of evidence in hundreds of cases they investigated and asked for further independent scrutiny and new testing to determine the extent to which individuals were wrongly convicted with faulty evidence.

My amendment ensures that Congress will exercise some oversight of the program. It will ensure the integrity and security of the DNA collection and storage and procedures. It is my hope that my amendment will minimize wrongful convictions and will make the DNA storage and collection process more reliable.

SCHIFF AMENDMENT

I note that one of my colleagues on the Subcommittee offered an amendment, Mr. SCHIFF. I do not agree with this amendment. The amendment would require that DNA be collected from all arrestees. This amendment has serious civil liberties concerns.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, the reauthorization of this important program

also provides us with an opportunity to investigate some important related issues.

From my work on this issue, I've learned that the Federal Government is unable to determine how many hits the Federal Government informs States about are actually followed up on by law enforcement. I think this data is very important for policymakers to have.

A few years ago, USA Today engaged in a comprehensive examination of DNA cases. In one case, the DNA of a convicted child molester matched DNA from an attempted sexual assault of a 10-year-old girl. Police did not contact the offender until after he had molested another 10-year-old child 6 months later.

In another case, the DNA of a career felon matched DNA left at a rape and abduction from 2001. At the time the offender was serving a prison sentence for assault. The police did not contact him until 8 months later, after he had been released from prison and only after being alerted by the rape victim, who encountered the offender by chance while walking in a local park.

These are two examples of situations where there was a match made in the Federal database. States were informed about it, but no action was taken, with tragic consequences. Therefore, I have authored a provision in this bill that would direct the Department of Justice Inspector General to investigate and report on how many CODIS database hits are actually followed up on by law enforcement, how many of those hits are ultimately brought to the attention of a prosecutor and how many go to trial.

Importantly, the report will also shed additional light on the factors that play in the event that matches were not followed up on. In particular, we asked the IG to determine the reason why matches were not pursued accordingly, and to determine the resulting impact on the criminal justice system, namely, whether other crimes were committed that could have been prevented if the matches were pursued accordingly.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote for the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act (H.R. 5057), a bill that I cosponsored and strongly support. I appreciate the efforts of my colleague from New York, Mrs. MALONEY, in bringing this legislation and previous bills regarding DNA evidence to the House floor.

A tragic death that took place in my District early this year highlights the need for Congress to support the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program at the U.S. Department of Justice, DOJ. As many of my colleagues know from national news reports, nineteen-year-old Brianna Denison was abducted, strangled to death, and left in a vacant field in southeast Reno. Based on DNA evidence, law enforcement determined that Brianna's murder was the work of a serial offender linked to several other attacks in the Reno area.

Like a majority of states, Nevada has experienced a significant backlog in DNA processing. At the time of Brianna's murder, more

than 3,000 samples were waiting to be processed in Nevada alone. Local law enforcement petitioned the Reno community for donations that would enable them to expedite processing of samples collected as part of Brianna's case and tackle the statewide backlog. Nevadans contributed nearly \$300,000 to eliminate the backlog of DNA samples in our State.

This significant outpouring of support demonstrates the American people's commitment to fighting crime through DNA technology. Congress should take this opportunity to mirror the priorities of those we represent. In an age where DNA technology has the potential to solve previously unsolvable crimes and quickly put violent offenders behind bars, there is no excuse for failing to equip law enforcement agencies with the tools and personnel they need to quickly process DNA.

The Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act provides a vital means of reducing the DNA evidence backlog in labs across the country. I joined 26 of my colleagues, including the author of this legislation, in sending a letter to appropriators earlier this year urging appropriators to provide full funding for the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program. Few investments could be more important to effective law enforcement in the 21st century. The national DNA database has made matches or otherwise aided in more than 51,000 cases since its inception. While the DNA of Brianna's killer was unfortunately not detected as Nevada's samples were processed in recent months, it is quite possible that the DNA of Brianna's killer is backlogged in another state. Also worth noting is the fact that Nevada law enforcement was able to link 30 unsolved cases to known offenders as a result of eliminating our state's DNA backlog. Assuming a similar success rate nationwide, hundreds—if not thousands—of criminals could be put behind bars if law enforcement could process all DNA samples on hand. Thousands of victims and families whose cases are currently unsolved could find closure.

Ensuring that all crime-related DNA samples are entered in the nationwide database makes every community in every district safer. Supporting the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program tells law enforcement that Congress supports their crimefighting efforts with the best technology available, and shows the American people our commitment to taking violent criminals off our streets. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act as well as efforts to provide full funding for this vital program.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5057, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2008" (reauthorizing Title II of P.L. 108-405). This Act authorizes funding to eliminate the large backlogs of DNA crime scene samples awaiting testing in State forensic labs. I am in support of this bill.

In recent years, law enforcement agencies have realized the critical value that DNA evidence has in quickly solving cases. Often, a DNA sample result can scientifically link a perpetrator to a crime or prove a defendant's innocence with virtual certainty. Many of the Nation's Federal and State criminal forensics laboratories currently are overwhelmed with innumerable samples awaiting DNA analysis.

Named for Debbie Smith, who was kidnapped in her Virginia home and raped in nearby woods by a stranger, the Debbie Smith

DNA Backlog Grant Program authorized grant money to states to collect samples from crime scenes and convicted persons, conduct DNA analyses, and enter these results into a comprehensive national database. Debbie Smith's attacker remained unidentified for over six years, until a DNA sample collected from a convicted person serving time in a Virginia State prison revealed his involvement in her rape. Although eventually identified, the six years between crime and identification allowed Ms. Smith's attacker to engage in more criminal activity.

Re-authorization of the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program will help law enforcement throughout the Nation. It will facilitate the development of a comprehensive national database against which samples from current crime scenes can be compared. It will allow laboratories to reduce the currently unacceptable delays in processing DNA samples. Finally, it will provide law enforcement and prosecutors strong tools to quickly identify and prosecute criminals, minimizing the costs of investigation and prosecution, the possibility of prosecuting the wrong person and the possibility of future heinous crimes.

Recognizing that the backlog of biological evidence that had to be entered in State databases was preventing law enforcement officials from solving many of the Nation's most heinous crimes, like the tragedy that befell Debbie Smith, Congress passed the DNA "Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000" (P.L. 106-546). The bill authorized the Attorney General to make grants to eligible States to collect DNA samples from convicted individuals and crime scenes for inclusion in the federal DNA database, Combined DNA Index System (CODIS), and to increase the capacity of State crime laboratories. The Act required the Bureau of Prisons and the military to collect DNA samples from convicted individuals and forward these samples for analysis, and required the FBI to expand its CODIS database to include the analyses of these DNA samples.

The Act also amended the criminal code to require all defendants on probation or supervised release to cooperate with the collection of a DNA sample. The Act expressed the sense of Congress that State grants should be conditioned upon the State's agreement to ensure post-conviction DNA testing in appropriate cases; and that Congress should work with the States to improve the quality of legal representation in capital cases. Finally, the Act authorized an unspecified amount of appropriations to the Attorney General to carry out the Act.

In 2004, DNA backlog elimination was incorporated into the Justice for All Act of 2004", P.L. 108-405 and was renamed the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, which became Title II of P.L. 108-405. While the Act authorized \$151 million for each fiscal year 2005-2009, Congress did not appropriate any money until FY 2008, at which time it appropriated \$147.4 million.

The Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program expires at the end of FY 2009. H.R. 5057, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act," which has strong bipartisan support, would renew the law and authorize \$151 million for each fiscal year 2009-2014. H.R. 5057 specifies that not less than 40 percent of the total amount awarded in grants must be used for DNA analyses of samples from crime scenes,

rape kits and other sexual assault evidence, and in cases that do not have an identified suspect.

AMENDMENT

While I support this legislation, I successfully offered an amendment at subcommittee markup. My amendment would require the Attorney General to evaluate the integrity and security of DNA collection and storage practices and procedures at a sample of crime laboratories throughout the country to determine the extent to which DNA samples are tampered with or are otherwise contaminated in such laboratories. The sample should be a representative sample and should include at least one lab from each State. My amendment would require the Attorney General to conduct this evaluation annually and the Attorney General should be required to submit the evaluation to Congress. This amendment is necessary.

A district attorney in Harris County, Texas used evidence to wrongfully convict persons based upon faulty evidence. An investigation into the Houston Police Department's crime lab revealed that bad management, under-trained staff, false documentation, and inaccurate work cast doubt on thousands of DNA-based convictions. Investigators raised serious questions about the reliability of evidence in hundreds of cases they investigated and asked for further independent scrutiny and new testing to determine the extent to which individuals were wrongly convicted with faulty evidence.

My amendment ensures that Congress will exercise some oversight of the program. It will ensure the integrity and security of the DNA collection and storage and procedures. It is my hope that my amendment will minimize wrongful convictions and will make the DNA storage and collection process more reliable.

SCHIFF AMENDMENT

I note that one of my colleagues on the Subcommittee offered an amendment, Mr. SCHIFF. I do not agree with this amendment. The amendment would require that DNA be collected from all arrestees. This amendment has serious civil liberties concerns.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5057, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to reauthorize the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS PILOT EXTENSION ACT OF 2008

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 3218) to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 3218

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2008”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 108(a)(3)(A) of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) is amended by striking “a 60-month” and inserting “a 66-month”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Criminal History Background Checks Pilots Extension Act of 2008 will allow a simple 6-month extension to the National Child Safety Pilot Program passed as a part of the PROTECT Act of 2003.

I am proud to sponsor the House version of this bill. The Senate has already taken up the legislation by unanimous consent, so if the House votes to pass this bill, as I hope it will, it will go to the President to be signed into law.

We're fortunate to have millions of Americans who generously give their time and energy to volunteer and mentor children. In 1986, as a then young lawyer, I volunteered as a Big Brother for a 7-year-old in the Greater Los Angeles area. That relationship has been one of the most rewarding and enduring that I've ever had. It also taught me firsthand the trust that we place in the adult in a mentoring situation. It's important that we protect children by taking reasonable and practical steps to help guard against the chance that a convicted child abuser or sex offender might conceal his or her past and place our children at risk.

Since 2003, and earlier, States have been authorized to access national fingerprint-based background checks through the FBI on behalf of youth-serving organizations. Unfortunately, as of today, only one-third of States have the infrastructure in place for a youth-serving organization to get a background check from the FBI in an affordable and timely manner.

In passing the PROTECT Act, Congress acted in response to the need to

protect children from predators who could gain access to children under the guise of volunteering. Mentoring groups, large and small, want access to the information they need to protect children, and the pilot has been extremely successful in providing that access through a fee-supported system at no cost to taxpayers.

The pilot demonstrated that there was a clear need for this program to protect children. Six percent of checks conducted came back with serious criminal records, in many cases records that would have not turned up through a search of a State database or through a name-based commercial search. We have cases from around the Nation in which applicants for volunteering positions with children were sex offenders, repeat felons, and child abusers.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reviewed files in which an applicant had a criminal record in four States, including a conviction for murder, which they didn't reveal to the organization. Losing access to these checks would be disastrous for hundreds of small, community-based mentoring organizations.

Due to the success of the program, we have extended the pilot twice before. It is now set to expire July 31 unless we extend it again. This bill would provide a 6-month extension to give us all time to work on an appropriate permanent bill that protects our children, while also protecting the privacy of potential volunteers.

I am proud to sponsor, along with my colleague, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, the Child Protection Improvements Act, a bill which would do just that. We will continue to work with stakeholders and the Judiciary Committee to put in place a permanent system of protection.

The pilot program has demonstrated that youth-serving organizations correctly want to watch out for children and want access to affordable, accurate and prompt background checks to help them do so. We need to keep the pilot program in place while we develop the permanent bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3218, the Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2008, which extends the Child Safety Pilot Program for volunteer organizations for an additional 6 months.

Originally created in 2003 under the PROTECT Act, the Child Safety Pilot Program has proven to be an effective resource for groups such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, the National Mentoring Partnership, and the National Council of Youth Sports.

Through the pilot program, any non-profit organization that provides youth-focused care, as defined in the National Child Protection Act of 1993,

may request criminal history background checks from the FBI on applicants for volunteer or employee positions that entail working with children.

Currently, over 10,000 background checks have been administered through the Child Safety Pilot Program. Of those checks, 7.5 percent of all workers screened had an arrest or conviction on their record. Crimes uncovered included rape, child sexual abuse, murder, and domestic battery. Over 25 percent of applicants with a criminal record committed crimes in States other than where they were applying to work. If it weren't for the Child Safety Pilot Program, employers may not have known that the applicants had criminal records.

Volunteer organizations across the country are working hard to provide safe learning and growing environments for our children. That means hiring professional and responsible employees. S. 3218 extends a program that has successfully helped these groups do just that.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague in urging passage of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 3218, the “Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2008”. First, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, ADAM SCHIFF of California, for introducing this much-needed piece of legislation. This bill will amend the “PROTECT Act of 2003” by extending for six months the currently expiring Child Safety Pilot Program. This program will allow certain volunteer organizations to obtain national and state criminal history background checks on their volunteers. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this act.

The “Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2008” is critical because it will ensure that our Nation's children remain safe from predators and sex-offenders. By allowing volunteer organizations working with children the option of State and Federal background checks, we protect our children from our greatest fear: that the very organizations that set out to help our children, inadvertently harm them.

The “PROTECT Act of 2003” was aimed at defending children from the horrors of exploitation, abuse, and abduction. Yet, if we fail to act now, the act's 60-month “Child Safety Pilot Program” will expire. We cannot afford to leave volunteer groups without this critical tool, and in the process leave countless children at risk.

Upon enactment, the “Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2008” will extend by 6 months the “Child Safety Pilot Program”, and will allow certain volunteer organizations to continue utilizing the national and state criminal history background checks. With passage of this act, we take one step forward to a day when all the children of our Nation are safe from the harms and horrors of abuse.

Currently in the US, there are over 100,000 cases of child abuse, abduction, or exploitation, each year. It is imperative that we do not allow this number to escalate out of carelessness. Why should we allow an extra Amber Alert to occur when it would be so easy to prevent?

The Amber Alert Network which was first implemented in the State of Texas is an important element in attaining a truly secure environment. This system is part of an additional level of protection. Yet, programs like Amber Alert lose their significance when they are not accompanied by meaningful precautions. The background checks that the "Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2008" makes possible, allow us to stop Amber Alerts before they happen.

I have always seen the safety of children as an issue of tremendous importance. Whether it is through this bill, protecting children from sex-offenders, or in recent legislation such as H.R. 3397, safeguarding children against lead-poisoning, or in other acts improving school safety, I believe that the well-being of our children must be one of our foremost concerns.

I urge my colleagues to support this act to protect the children of Texas' 18th and the children of our Nation.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 3218.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A CHILD IS MISSING ALERT AND RECOVERY CENTER ACT

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5464) to direct the Attorney General to make an annual grant to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center to assist law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing children, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5464

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act".

SEC. 2. DIRECTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO MAKE ANNUAL GRANTS TO A CHILD IS MISSING ALERT AND RECOVERY CENTER TO ASSIST LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IN RECOVERING MISSING CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, shall annually make a grant to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center.

(b) SPECIFIED USE OF FUNDS FOR RECOVERY ACTIVITIES, REGIONAL CENTERS, EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION SHARING.—A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center shall use the funds made available under this Act—

(1) to operate and expand the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center to provide services to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to promote the quick recovery of a missing child in response to a request from such agencies for assistance by utilizing rapid alert telephone calls, text messaging, and satellite mapping technology;

(2) to maintain and expand technologies and techniques to ensure the highest level of performance of such services;

(3) to establish and maintain regional centers to provide both centralized and on-site training and to distribute information to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agency officials about how to best utilize the services provided by the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center;

(4) to share appropriate information with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the AMBER Alert Coordinator, and appropriate Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(5) to assist the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the AMBER Alert Coordinator, and appropriate Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies with education programs.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF MISSING CHILD.

For purposes of this Act, the term "missing child" means an individual whose whereabouts are unknown to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For grants under section 2, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year from fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have an additional 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5464, the "A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act," helps address the terrifying experience of when a family member or friend goes missing.

Under current law, there are programs such as Amber Alert to help missing children who are abducted or become victims of foul play. But these programs do not extend to situations where a child or elderly person becomes missing in other more innocent ways. H.R. 5464 fills this gap and authorizes money for annual grants to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center. This national nonprofit program provides assistance to local law enforcement throughout the country in all situations of missing persons, not only those involved in criminal activity.

The center helps when a small child fails to come home from school or a

grandmother suffering from Alzheimer's disease walks out of her home in the middle of the night. When the terrifying event of a missing person is reported to the police, the responding police officer can call the center, which operates 365 days a year, 24 hours a day. Based on information from the call, the center quickly prepares a recorded message that includes a description of the missing person, along with a location where the person was last seen. Within minutes, the center sends this recording to thousands of phones within a radius of the last known location. This activity can save not only precious lives, but also critically needed enforcement resources that would otherwise be spent in extended searches for missing persons.

The bill before us today will make a significant contribution to the protection of children and vulnerable adults throughout the United States. I want to thank the sponsor of this bill, Ron Klein of Florida, for his leadership on this very important issue. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5464, a bill that would authorize the A Child Is Missing Program for the next 5 years.

I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) for his work on this important bill.

The A Child Is Missing Program is an unsung tool that our law enforcement and communities have been using since 1997 to locate missing children and also elderly that are missing due to Alzheimer's or other difficulties.

I would also like to recognize the founder of this program that was founded back in January 1997. I had the opportunity to meet with her in Cincinnati, the Greater Cincinnati area, Norwood, in particular, Sherry Friedlander, who is in the gallery today. And if she could stand, I would like to acknowledge her.

Statistics released by the Center for Missing and Exploited Children reveal that more than 2,000 children go missing each day in this country. Let me repeat that, 2,000 children go missing every day in this country.

□ 1700

We know that the first couple of hours a child is missing are critical to the successful recovery of that child. While the AMBER Alert is a critical tool, it takes hours to initiate. The A Child Is Missing program fills that void, alerting and mobilizing the community almost immediately. The A Child Is Missing program has been credited with over 300 safe-assisted recoveries and is supported by law enforcement organizations all over the country. In my own district, the First District of Ohio, local law enforcement agencies have directly benefited from

the program. In fact, just this past May, we highlighted the program's success in the city of Norwood, as I mentioned before, Norwood, Ohio.

H.R. 5464 will ensure that the program has the resources it needs over the next 5 years to continue serving communities like Norwood, Ohio, and communities all over the country. I urge my colleagues to support this critical program by passing H.R. 5464.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from references to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the lead sponsor of H.R. 5464 to urge my colleagues to vote in support of the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act. And before I begin, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Ohio, as he supported the bill in committee as well; as well as Mr. CONYERS of Michigan, the Chair of our Judiciary Committee; and the Chair of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, for their extraordinary leadership and support in moving this bill out of their committees and on to the floor. And also I would like to acknowledge and thank the ranking members, Mr. SMITH and Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. GOHMERT was especially supportive during the hearing on the legislation in the Crime Subcommittee, and I would personally like to thank him for his remarks and support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5464 would expand the widely praised A Child is Missing nonprofit organization into a national program with regional centers under the Department of Justice. The authorized funds would allow for the purchase of future technologies and techniques, centralized and on-site training, and for the distribution of information to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agency officials on the best ways to utilize the round-the-clock services provided by the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center.

Currently, A Child is Missing is the only program of its kind that assists in all missing cases involving abduction, children who are lost, wander, or run away; and adults with special needs such as the elderly who suffer with Alzheimer's, which is a concern in my district in south Florida.

When a person is reported missing to the police, A Child is Missing utilizes the latest technology to place 1,000 emergency telephone calls every 60 seconds to residents and businesses in the area where the person was last seen. It works in concert with the existing AMBER Alert system and all other child safety programs and has the support of law enforcement agencies all across our country.

A Child is Missing also fills a critical gap in time in the most dangerous cases. Although the AMBER Alert has been an extremely successful program, there is still a crucial void of 3 to 5 hours in many cases from when a child is first reported missing and when an AMBER Alert shows up on our highways or is announced, which is only activated when cases of criminal abduction have been issued. This critical period of time can be the difference between whether a child lives or dies. Recently, a Washington State Attorney General's office study showed that among cases involving children abducted and murdered, 74 percent were slain in the first 3 hours. This only highlights the importance of this time element. Adding to this problem is the resource and manpower limitations facing many local law enforcement agencies. Roughly half of these officers in the United States have 25 or fewer officers, and an average 12-hour search for a missing child can cost up to \$400,000.

A Child is Missing helps to fill this critical gap in time as well as complement the AMBER Alert during the ongoing search. We know this for a fact because we have heard it from countless law enforcement officers from all over the United States.

So the issue isn't whether A Child is Missing works or not. The real issue is that not enough local communities have access to the program. The founder and president of A Child is Missing, Sherry Friedlander from my home community of Ft. Lauderdale, has done an exceptional job in creating and spreading this program not only in our community but throughout all 50 States. But if we are going to bring the program to every community in all these States, then we will need to leverage the resources of the Federal Government, and that's exactly what this legislation does.

H.R. 5464 has broad bipartisan support in Congress. We have cosponsors from all across the country including Ohio, Kentucky, Texas, Indiana, and New York. In the Senate companion legislation was introduced by Senator MENENDEZ and is cosponsored by Senator HATCH, the distinguished former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. We have such support because A Child is Missing provides a service that transcends politics. Our children are not Democrats or Republicans. They are our children, and they are all of our responsibility, and their protection requires us to work together to do what's best for their continued safety.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues today to support H.R. 5464.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for your leadership in bringing this very important bill to the floor. I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. This bill is good and it is necessary.

The bill is sponsored by Mr. KLEIN and has bi-partisan support. It has 21 cosponsors, including the following Judiciary members: Chairman CONYERS, Chairman SCOTT, Mr.

CHABOT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. WASSEMAN SCHULTZ.

A child goes missing every 40 seconds. The successful recovery of missing children often requires a quick response. In 1997, Sherry Friedlander, the founder of A Child is Missing (ACIM), saw the need for a rapid-response program to persons who go missing, especially in situations that do not involve abductions. In response to this need, she established ACIM, a national non-profit organization that offers free assistance to law enforcement 365 days of the year, 24 hours per day. The program is not limited to children, but extends to elderly persons (suffering from senility or Alzheimer's), mentally challenged or disabled individuals and college students.

When law enforcement receives a call regarding a missing person, the first-responder can immediately call ACIM for help. The officer provides critical information to ACIM, such as the person's age and description and the last time/place seen. ACIM uses that information to record a message that, within minutes, is sent via phone to 1000s of locations within a radius of the last sighting of the person. Through their computer mapping system, ACIM also can identify "hot spots," such as water or wooded areas.

ACIM complements the Amber Alert program by providing different services. While Amber Alert focuses on children who are abducted, ACIM covers all "persons" who go missing, including situations where criminal intent may not be at issue. Amber Alert uses television and highway signs to broadcast information about the abducted child and the related vehicle, while ACIM uses a rapid response telephone alert system and covers cases where there is no vehicle involved. The ACIM notification system often can respond more quickly than the Amber Alert program.

ACIM would use the requested money to operate and expand the existing ACIM office in Florida, to develop Regional Centers for on-site training and communication with local law enforcement, to maintain and expand their computer and phone technologies, and to assist the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the AMBER Alert Coordinator, and appropriate law enforcement agencies with training.

H.R. 5464 authorizes \$5 million annual grants for 2009 through 2014 to A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center (ACIM) to assist law enforcement in the rapid recovery of missing children and other individuals.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses and look forward to their testimony. I hope that we can ensure the health and safety of the young and the elderly—two vulnerable populations—whose rights I have long championed.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5464.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 231) to authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 231

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS.

Section 508 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3758) is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2006” through the period and inserting “for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2012.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, or Byrne/JAG Program, is named after Edward Byrne, a New York City police officer killed by a violent drug gang 20 years ago.

The Byrne/JAG Program is the only source of Federal funding for multi-jurisdictional efforts to prevent and fight crime. The funding is used by States and local governments to support a broad range of activities to prevent and control crime and to improve the criminal justice system.

Specific uses include law enforcement, prosecution, and court programs; crime prevention and education programs; community-based programs; drug treatment, planning, and evaluation efforts; and crime victim and witness programs.

Simply put, this program enables States to employ all aspects of fighting crime, rather than simply using the so-called “get tough” approach limited to making more arrests and making sentences longer.

Nationwide, the program has resulted in major innovations in crime control, including drug courts, gang prevention strategies, and prisoner reentry pro-

grams, all of which provide proven and highly effective crime prevention.

In turn, these innovations demonstrate that the best crime policy incorporates programs that help at-risk youth avoid criminal behavior and that prepare prisoners for reentry into society so they have meaningful and productive alternatives to crime when they return home.

S. 231 would simply reauthorize the Byrne/JAG Program at its current funding level, which is \$1.095 billion, through 2012. The House passed substantially identical legislation by voice vote last month. Passing the Senate version will enable us to send this important bill to the President.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 231, a bill to reauthorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program through fiscal year 2012.

This bill continues to fund the Department of Justice Byrne/JAG Grant Program at the fiscal year 2006 level. The House passed companion legislation, H.R. 3546, just a few weeks ago.

The Byrne/JAG Program provides assistance to State and local law enforcement officials. These grants support a wide range of law enforcement activities to prevent and control crime and improve the criminal justice system. Byrne/JAG grants may be used to help pay for personnel, overtime, or equipment. Funds are also used for statewide initiatives, technical assistance, and training.

In June the FBI released its 2007 Unified Crime Report detailing the statistics for violent crime nationwide. The rate for violent crimes, including robbery, sexual assault, and murder, decreased nationally. However, the report also showed that the rate of violent crime increased in some communities across the country.

Our Nation's law enforcement officials are dedicated to preventing crime and keeping our communities safe, and their efforts should be applauded. Congress plays an important role in supporting State and local law enforcement officials by continuing to reauthorize programs like this at appropriate levels.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of reauthorization of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program. As a cosponsor of the House version of this bill, I am pleased that this legislation will reauthorize a program that is vital not only to my District, but to Iowa, and States across the country.

Byrne JAG is one of our country's most effective law enforcement tools. It is the only source of federal funding for multi-jurisdictional efforts to prevent, fight, and prosecute drug-related and violent crime. The program funds drug treatment; keeps our communities safe

by increasing the number of officers on the street; and gives local law enforcement officers the tools they need to shut down the production and distribution of illegal drugs.

With the help of Byrne JAG funding, State and local law enforcement officers across the country have made tremendous strides in combating illegal drugs. A recent study found that Byrne JAG funded programs have led to 220,000 arrests, the seizure of 54,000 weapons; the destruction of 5.5 million grams of methamphetamine, and the elimination of almost 9,000 methamphetamine labs.

In Iowa, reported methamphetamine labs have dropped 90 percent since their peak in 2004. Meanwhile, meth treatment admissions have increased and Iowa now has the third highest rate of meth treatment in the country. Child abuse due to meth labs is in decline, and three recent Iowa Youth Surveys have shown steady decline in substance use among 6th, 8th, and 11th grade students.

What these statistics make clear is that Byrne JAG is proven, effective, and critical to public safety. This reauthorization lays the groundwork for robust funding for Byrne JAG through 2012, and I urge my colleagues to not only support adoption of the bill but to also support full funding for the program in this and coming years.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 231 to reauthorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, Byrne-JAG, Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012. The Byrne-JAG monies are supposed to be used to make America a safer place. I support the reauthorization, and I would urge my colleagues to do likewise.

WHY BYRNE-JAG IS NECESSARY

Byrne-JAG allows States and local governments to support a broad range of activities to prevent and control crime and to improve the criminal justice system, which States and local governments have come to rely on to ensure public safety. They support: law enforcement, prosecution and court programs, prevention and education, corrections and community programs, drug treatment, planning, evaluation, technology improvement programs, and crime victim and witness programs, other than compensation. In short, they are an indispensable resource that States use to combat crime.

RECENT CUTS IN BYRNE JAG FUNDING

Unfortunately, in fiscal year 2008 the Byrne-JAG program was cut by two-thirds. Although Congress authorized over \$1 billion, only \$520 million were appropriated for fiscal year 2007. The appropriation was then drastically reduced to \$170.4 million in fiscal year 2008, and the President has proposed further cuts for the fiscal year 2009 budget.

PAST PROBLEMS WITH BYRNE JAG

The trend to reduce the grant funding may result, in part, from instances where Byrne-JAG funding has been abused. For example, in 1999 Byrne-JAG funding was used in the infamous Tulia outrage in which a rogue police narcotics officer in Texas set up dozens of people, most of them African-American, in false cocaine trafficking charges. In other instances, jurisdictions used the funding to fund task forces focused solely on ineffective, low-level drug arrests, which has put the task force concept and the diminished standards of drug enforcement that it has come to represent—in the national spotlight.

The most well-known Byrne-funded scandal occurred in Tulia, Texas where dozens of African-American residents, representing 16 percent of the town's black population, were arrested, prosecuted and sentenced to decades in prison, even though the only evidence against them was the uncorroborated testimony of one white undercover officer with a history of lying and racism. The undercover officer worked alone, and had no audiotapes, video surveillance, or eyewitnesses to corroborate his allegations. Suspicions eventually arose after two of the accused defendants were able to produce firm evidence showing they were out-of-State or at work at the time of the alleged drug buys. Texas Governor Rick Perry eventually pardoned the Tulia defendants, after four years of imprisonment, but these kinds of scandals continue to plague the Byrne grant program.

These scandals are not the result of a few "bad apples" in law enforcement; they are the result of a fundamentally flawed bureaucracy that is prone to corruption by its very structure. Byrne-funded regional anti-drug task forces are Federally funded, State managed, and locally staffed, which means they do not really have to answer to anyone. In fact, their ability to perpetuate themselves through asset forfeiture and Federal funding makes them unaccountable to local taxpayers and governing bodies.

The scandals are more widespread than just a few instances. A 2002 report by the ACLU of Texas identified 17 scandals involving Byrne-funded anti-drug task forces in Texas, including cases of falsifying government records, witness tampering, fabricating evidence, stealing drugs from evidence lockers, selling drugs to children, large-scale racial profiling, sexual harassment, and other abuses of official capacity.

Texas is not the only State that has suffered from Byrne-funded law enforcement scandals. Scandals in other States have included the misuse of millions of dollars in Federal grant money in Kentucky and Massachusetts, false convictions based upon police perjury in Missouri, and making deals with drug offenders to drop or lower their charges in exchange for money or vehicles in Alabama, Arkansas, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin. A 2001 study by the Government Accountability Office found that the Federal Government fails to adequately monitor the grant program and hold grantees accountable.

AMENDMENT CONSIDERED BUT NOT OFFERED

Because of these abuses, I would have offered an amendment when this bill was considered at the Full Judiciary Committee markup. My amendment would have addressed the responsible use of Byrne-JAG monies. Specifically, my amendment would have required that a State that receives Byrne-JAG money should collect data for the most recent year for which such funds were allocated to such State, with respect to:

- (1) The racial distribution of criminal charges made during that year;
- (2) the nature of the criminal law specified in the charges made; and
- (3) the city of law enforcement jurisdiction in which the charges were made.

My amendment would have required a condition of receiving funds that the State should submit to the Attorney General the data collected by not later than one year after the date the State received funds. Lastly, the report

should be posted on the Bureau of Justice Statistics website and submitted to the Attorney General.

My amendment is good because arrests will be transparent and the light of day and public airing of any problems will be the greatest disinfectant. My amendment is an attempt to make law enforcement more responsible, more accountable, and more just in their dealings with persons of all races and backgrounds. My amendment is but a small price to pay to rid the Nation of scandals and disasters that occurred in Tulia, Texas and elsewhere.

My amendment, which I would have offered, would provide oversight and accountability. It is not burdensome. It will not prevent the States from collecting and funding programs under the Byrne Grant program. My amendment does, however, shed light on any maladies that might exist in the system. Once we see the problems, we can fix them. My amendment is responsible and aims to make the Byrne-Grant program a better program by ensuring that the funding is used appropriately and is used with oversight.

NO MORE TULIAS

While I support the Byrne-JAG reauthorization, I would also urge my colleagues to also support my bill, H.R. 253, No More Tulias: Drug Law Enforcement Evidentiary Standards Improvement Act of 2007. This bill also enhances accountability with respect to the use of Byrne-JAG monies.

First, it prohibits a State from receiving for a fiscal year any drug control and system improvement (Byrne) grant funds, or any other amount from any other law enforcement assistance program of the Department of Justice, unless the State does not fund any anti-drug task forces for that fiscal year or the State has in effect laws that ensure that: (1) a person is not convicted of a drug offense unless the facts that a drug offense was committed and that the person committed that offense are supported by evidence other than the eyewitness testimony of a law enforcement officer or individuals acting on an officer's behalf; and (2) an officer does not participate in a antidrug task force unless that officer's honesty and integrity is evaluated and found to be at an appropriately high level.

Second, H.R. 253, No More Tulias, requires that states receiving Federal funds under the No More Tulias Act to collect data on the racial distribution of drug charges, the nature of the criminal law specified in the charges, and the jurisdictions in which such charges are made. I urge my colleagues to support my No More Tulias Act so that we can quickly bring the bill to markup.

I also urge my colleagues to support Byrne-JAG.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in urging passage of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 231.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 415, TAUNTON RIVER WILD AND SCENIC DESIGNATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-758) on the resolution (H. Res. 1339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 415) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 1067, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 1080, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Con. Res. 297, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CROSSING OF THE NORTH POLE BY THE USS "NAUTILUS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1067, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1067.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 0, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—375

Abercrombie	Delahunt	Keller
Ackerman	DeLauro	Kennedy
Aderholt	Dent	Kildee
Akin	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)
Allen	Dicks	Kingston
Altmire	Dingell	Kirk
Arcuri	Doggett	Klein (FL)
Baca	Donnelly	Kline (MN)
Bachus	Doyle	Knollenberg
Baird	Drake	Kucinich
Baldwin	Dreier	Kuhl (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	LaHood
Bartlett (MD)	Edwards (MD)	Lamborn
Barton (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Lampson
Bean	Ehlers	Langevin
Becerra	Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Emanuel	Larson (CT)
Berman	Emerson	Latham
Berry	Engel	Latta
Biggert	English (PA)	Lee
Bilbray	Eshoo	Levin
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Everett	Lewis (KY)
Bishop (NY)	Fallin	Linder
Bishop (UT)	Farr	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Fattah	Loebsack
Blumenauer	Feeney	Lofgren, Zoe
Blunt	Ferguson	Lowey
Boehner	Filner	Lucas
Bono Mack	Flake	Lungren, Daniel E.
Boozman	Forbes	Lynch
Boren	Fortenberry	Mack
Boucher	Foster	Mahoney (FL)
Boustany	Fox	Manzullo
Boyd (FL)	Frank (MA)	Marchant
Boyd (KS)	Frelinghuysen	Markley
Brady (PA)	Gallely	Marshall
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Matheson
Brown (SC)	Gerlach	Matsui
Brown-Waite,	Giffords	McCarthy (CA)
Ginny	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Buchanan	Gillibrand	McCaul (TX)
Burgess	Gingrey	McCollum (MN)
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	McCotter
Butterfield	Gonzalez	McCrery
Buyer	Goode	McDermott
Calvert	Goodlatte	McGovern
Camp (MI)	Gordon	McHenry
Campbell (CA)	Green, Gene	McHugh
Cannon	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
Cantor	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Capito	Hare	McMorris
Capps	Harman	Rodgers
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Carnahan	Hayes	Meek (FL)
Carney	Heller	Meeks (NY)
Carson	Hensarling	Melancon
Carter	Herger	Mica
Castle	Herseht Sandlin	Michaud
Castor	Higgins	Miller (FL)
Cazayoux	Hill	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Hinchey	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Childers	Hirono	Mitchell
Clarke	Hobson	Mollohan
Clay	Hodes	Moore (WI)
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Clyburn	Holden	Murphy (CT)
Coble	Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Cohen	Honda	Murphy, Tim
Cole (OK)	Hookey	Musgrave
Conaway	Hoyer	Myrick
Conyers	Hunter	Nadler
Cooper	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano
Courtney	Inslee	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Israel	Nunes
Crowley	Issa	Oberstar
Cuellar	Jackson (IL)	Oliver
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Cummings	(TX)	Pallone
Davis (AL)	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Davis, David	Jones (NC)	Payne
Davis, Lincoln	Jordan	Pence
Deal (GA)	Kagen	Perlmutter
DeFazio	Kanjorski	
DeGette	Kaptur	

Peterson (MN)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sutton
Peterson (PA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Tanner
Petri	Sarbanes	Tauscher
Pickering	Scalise	Terry
Pitts	Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)
Poe	Schiff	Thompson (MS)
Pomeroy	Schmidt	Thornberry
Porter	Schwartz	Tiahrt
Price (GA)	Scott (GA)	Tierney
Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Tsongas
Putnam	Serrano	Turner
Rahall	Sessions	Upton
Ramstad	Sestak	Van Hollen
Rangel	Shadegg	Velázquez
Regula	Sherman	Visclosky
Rehberg	Shea-Porter	Walberg
Reichert	Sherman	Walden (OR)
Renzi	Shimkus	Walsh (NY)
Reyes	Shuler	Walz (MN)
Reynolds	Shuster	Wamp
Richardson	Simpson	Waters
Rodriguez	Skelton	Watson
Rogers (AL)	Slaughter	Watt
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Waxman
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Ross	Snyder	Wexler
Rothman	Solis	Whitfield (KY)
Roybal-Allard	Souder	Wilson (OH)
Royce	Space	Wilson (SC)
Ruppersberger	Speier	Wittman (VA)
Salazar	Spratt	Wolf
Sali	Stark	Wu
	Stearns	Yarmuth
	Stupak	Young (AK)
	Sullivan	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—59

Andrews	Green, Al	Pryce (OH)
Bachmann	Grijalva	Radanovich
Barrow	Gutierrez	Rohrabacher
Bonner	Hulshof	Rush
Boswell	Jefferson	Saxton
Braley (IA)	Johnson (IL)	Scott (VA)
Broun (GA)	Jones (OH)	Shays
Brown, Corrine	Kilpatrick	Sires
Costa	Kind	Tancredo
Costello	LaTourette	Taylor
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Tiberi
Cubin	Lipinski	Towns
Davis (CA)	Maloney (NY)	Udall (CO)
Davis, Tom	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
Doolittle	Moore (KS)	Wasserman
Ellison	Moran (VA)	Schultz
Fossella	Murtha	Welch (VT)
Franks (AZ)	Neal (MA)	Weller
Granger	Pearce	Wilson (NM)
Graves	Platts	Woolsey

□ 1859

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF THE 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1080, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1080, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 0, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—378

Abercrombie	Dent	King (IA)
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston
Akin	Dicks	Kirk
Alexander	Dingell	Klein (FL)
Allen	Doggett	Kline (MN)
Altmire	Donnelly	Knollenberg
Arcuri	Doyle	Kucinich
Baca	Drake	Kuhl (NY)
Bachus	Dreier	LaHood
Baird	Duncan	Lamborn
Baldwin	Edwards (MD)	Lampson
Barrett (SC)	Edwards (TX)	Langevin
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	Larsen (WA)
Barton (TX)	Ellsworth	Larson (CT)
Bean	Emanuel	Latham
Becerra	Emerson	Latta
Berkley	Engel	Lee
Berman	English (PA)	Levin
Berry	Eshoo	Lewis (CA)
Biggert	Etheridge	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Everett	Linder
Bilirakis	Fallin	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Loebsack
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Lowey
Blackburn	Ferguson	Lucas
Blumenauer	Filner	Lungren, Daniel E.
Blunt	Flake	Lynch
Boehner	Forbes	Mack
Bono Mack	Fortenberry	Mahoney (FL)
Boozman	Foster	Manzullo
Boren	Fox	Marchant
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Markley
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Marshall
Boyd (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Boyd (KS)	Gallely	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (SC)	Giffords	McCaul (TX)
Brown-Waite,	Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)
Ginny	Gillibrand	McCotter
Buchanan	Gingrey	McCrery
Burgess	Gohmert	McDermott
Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	McGovern
Butterfield	Goode	McHenry
Buyer	Goodlatte	McHugh
Calvert	Gordon	McIntyre
Camp (MI)	Green, Gene	McKeon
Campbell (CA)	Grijalva	McMorris
Cannon	Hall (NY)	Rodgers
Cantor	Hall (TX)	McNerney
Capito	Hare	McNulty
Capps	Harman	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	Melancon
Carnahan	Hayes	Mica
Carney	Heller	Michaud
Carson	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Carter	Herger	Miller (MI)
Castle	Herseht Sandlin	Miller (NC)
Castor	Higgins	Miller, Gary
Cazayoux	Hill	Mitchell
Chabot	Hinchey	Mollohan
Chandler	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Childers	Hobson	Moore (WI)
Clarke	Hodes	Moran (KS)
Clay	Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)
Cleaver	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Clyburn	Holt	Murphy, Tim
Coble	Honda	Musgrave
Cohen	Hookey	Myrick
Cole (OK)	Hoyer	Nadler
Conaway	Hunter	Napolitano
Conyers	Inglis (SC)	Neugebauer
Cooper	Inslee	Nunes
Courtney	Israel	Oberstar
Crenshaw	Issa	Obey
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Oliver
Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Culberson	(TX)	Pallone
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Davis (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Davis (KY)	Jones (NC)	Payne
Davis, David	Jordan	Pence
Davis, Lincoln	Kagen	Perlmutter
Deal (GA)	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)
DeGette	Keller	Petri
	Kennedy	Pickering
	Kildee	

Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—56

Andrews
Bachmann
Barrow
Bonner
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Cubin
Davis (CA)
Davis, Tom
Doolittle
Ellison
Fossella
Granger
Graves

Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hirono
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Kind
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Pearce
Platts

Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rush
Saxton
Scott (VA)
Shays
Sires
Speier
Tancred
Taylor
Tiberi
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Wasserman
Schultz
Weller
Wilson (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 487, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 297, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr.

COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 297, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 0, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

YEAS—378

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)

DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce

Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak

Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—56

Andrews
Bachmann
Barrow
Bonner
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Carter
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Cubin
Davis (CA)
Davis, Tom
Doolittle
Ellison
Fossella
Granger

Graves
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Kind
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Pearce

Platts
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rush
Saxton
Scott (VA)
Shays
Sires
Tancred
Taylor
Tiberi
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Wasserman
Schultz
Weller
Wilson (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1914

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the integration of the Armed Forces”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to personal reasons, I was unable to attend several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on H. Res. 1067—Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the crossing of the North Pole by the USS *Nautilus*, SSN 571, and its significance in the history of both our Nation and the world; “yea” on H. Res 1080—

Honoring the extraordinary service and exceptional sacrifice of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), known as the Screaming Eagles; and "yea" on H. Con. Res. 297—Recognizing the 60th anniversary of the integration of the United States Armed Forces.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 2008, I missed 3 recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on recorded vote No. 486, "yea" on recorded vote 487, and "yea" on recorded vote 488.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 14, 2008, I missed recorded votes. Had I been present, the RECORD would reflect the following votes:

1) H. Res. 1067—Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the crossing of the North Pole by the USS *Nautilus* (SSN 571) and its significance in the history of both our Nation and the world, "yes."

2) H. Res. 1080—Honoring the extraordinary service and exceptional sacrifice of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), known as the Screaming Eagles, "yes."

3) H. Con. Res. 297—Recognizing the 60th anniversary of the integration of the United States Armed Forces, "yes."

DEMOCRAT MAJORITY IS HOLDING AMERICA HOSTAGE

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s our Nation was held hostage by OPEC starting an oil embargo that drove up gasoline prices and damaged the American economy. Today it's not OPEC holding us hostage but rather the Democratic majority that refuses to expand domestic energy production.

My constituents are hurting, \$4.10 a gallon of gasoline for regular, smaller boxes of cereal, diesel prices are through the roof hurting those truckers and higher prices for air conditioning bills. All of these increased costs shrink the wallets of working Americans and hurt even more the seniors on fixed incomes.

When will this majority wake up and realize that 73 percent of America approves of drilling? When will the majority admit that their energy policy will do nothing at all to lower prices at the pump?

Mr. Speaker, ideas to raise the gas tax 50 cents when we are in the midst of a national gasoline crisis are a bad joke pushed on the American public. We need to support our constituents and support drilling.

HONORING THURGOOD MARSHALL ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I indicated earlier in the afternoon, H. Con. Res. 381 was being debated and that is the honoring and recognizing the dedication and achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth. Let me thank Congressman PAYNE for his legislative initiative, the House Judiciary Committee Chairman JOHN CONYERS and Ranking Member Mr. LAMAR SMITH.

I stand here today as a living example of the legacy and the leadership of Justice Thurgood Marshall. Who would have thought as he broke the color line in Brown versus Topeka Board of Education that he would have opened the doors of opportunity for those from the East to the West and from the North to the South?

Most people don't know that America during the 1950s and earlier than that continued to be a segregated America. It did not matter where you lived. Thurgood Marshall had the courage to take this case to the United States Supreme Court. And the Warren court had the courage and rightness of mind to be able to establish an equal education for all.

I applaud Thurgood Marshall who was appointed to the Court of Appeals by President John F. Kennedy and ultimately the first African American to sit on the United States Supreme Court. He was one who understood justice. He was one who recognized the equality of all people. He was one who recognized that America is better when it reflects and appreciates its diversity.

Thank you, Justice Marshall, for the freedom and the opportunity you have given even to me.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

FACES OF THE FALLEN MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, I received a notice from the Chief Administrative Officer and the Architect of the Capitol directing me to remove a memorial located outside of my office that honors fallen Marines from Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. The notice stated that the Faces of the Fallen memorial does not comply with the new hallway policy of the House.

However, memorials to honor the lives of those killed in Iraq and Afghanistan are respectfully displayed and should not fall under the Hallway Policy's jurisdiction.

In 2004, Congressman RAHM EMANUEL and I introduced legislation calling for an exhibit in the Capitol Rotunda to honor U.S. servicemembers who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our legislation was never considered. Instead, House Speaker Dennis Hastert directed the construction of a memorial listing names of the fallen in the foyer of the Rayburn House Office Building.

Because we believed more should be done to honor the lives of our fallen servicemembers, I, along with other Members of Congress, began to display more proper memorials outside our individual offices.

Hundreds of visitors from my district and others have stopped to view the faces of fallen Marines from Camp Lejeune displayed outside my door. It is seeing the faces of these Marines, the fathers, the mothers, the sisters, the brothers, the sons and the daughters that deeply impact these visitors.

Since the media has reported the attempt to remove the Faces of the Fallen memorial displayed outside my office, I have heard from constituents and people across the country who believe these memorials should remain on display.

An article published yesterday in the Jacksonville Daily News distributed in the area surrounding Camp Lejeune quoted two women who understand what it means to lose a loved one who has served our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the article for the RECORD.

The article quotes Deborah May, a woman whose husband was killed in Iraq in 2003. She told the Jacksonville Daily News that she has walked through the hallways of the House office buildings and she supports the memorials on display. And I quote Mrs. May: "When I go, I take my small children with me. The very least they could do is put a picture there to show my children that my husband is remembered and that this is what our government is about and our country and the freedoms we have."

The article also quotes Vivianne Wersel, the president of the Surviving Spouses Support Group at Camp Lejeune, who said that the memorial is as much as an icon as the American flag. And I quote her: "These servicemembers have given their lives for a conflict and something they believed in. I think that it is a reminder for those that are visiting Congress and that is what America is all about. They can walk the halls of Congress because of these young men that have given them the freedom to speak and the freedom to live."

Last week, I wrote a letter to Speaker NANCY PELOSI to explain the history behind these memorials and to ask her support in preserving their display. I know she understands the importance of honoring the servicemembers who have sacrificed for our Nation. And I thank her for honoring my request that the House observe a moment of silence each month to remember those killed

or wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan. I hope that Speaker PELOSI will agree with many of us in Congress and people across this Nation that these memorials should remain on display.

And before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to show a picture of a child whose father died in Iraq for this country. This is a picture of Tyler Jordan whose father, Phillip Jordan, was a gunnery sergeant with the United States Marine Corps. And this young man is receiving the flag on his father's grave on his coffin. Four years ago, I had this picture sent to me so I could blow it up. And I want to say this to Tyler Jordan: Your daddy, Phillip Jordan, is on this poster. He was killed along with others in the year 2003.

A name means a lot to those who are not here any longer. But nothing means more than for a child to come to Washington and to see his father's face outside a congressional office.

So again I have great respect for Speaker PELOSI. And I hope she will agree with us that these posters should remain outside the Members of Congress' office.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And I ask God to please bless America and help us to see the way to always remember those who died for this country and not forget them.

God bless America.

[From the Jacksonville Daily News, July 13, 2008]

JONES STANDS GROUND ON LEJEUNE
MEMORIAL IN HALL OUTSIDE OFFICE
(By Molly Dewitt)

A memorial honoring Camp Lejeune's fallen service members may have to come down.

A "Hallway Policy" approved by Nancy Pelosi, house speaker and chair of the House Office Building Commission, limits the display and placement of items in hallways of the House of Representatives office buildings. That includes a display erected by Representative Walter B. Jones (R-NC) outside his office.

Jones's Faces of the Fallen memorial consists of several easels displaying 3-by-1 posters bearing the names and faces of Marines from Camp Lejeune who died while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The policy specifically prohibits easels from being placed in a hallway.

"We're not talking about posters. We're not talking about things in the hall," Jones said. "We're talking about men and women that died for this country."

The hallway policy, instituted on April 17, was "developed to improve House compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Occupational Safety and Health Act as applied to Congress by the Congressional Accountability Act, and the Life Safety Code," according to the policy.

"This is just typical bureaucratic malarkey," Jones said.

No one has ever complained about loss of hallway accessibility due to the memorial, Jones said.

"I've never had anybody come in and tell me that they had trouble getting through the hall," he said.

"I've seen people with wheelchairs, I've seen a large number of people walk by and

it's never impeded anyone from getting through the hall."

Deborah May, whose husband Staff Sgt. Donald C. May Jr. was killed March 25, 2003 during Operation Iraqi Freedom, said she's walked the hallways in the House of Representatives office buildings.

"You could have a wheelchair race down those halls, because they're very wide," she said.

She wants the memorial display to remain. "When I go, I take my small children with me. The very least they could do is put a picture there to show my children that my husband is remembered and that this is what our government is about and our country and the freedoms we have," May said, tearing up.

The memorial has been displayed outside of Jones' various office locations for the past five years and several years ago an initial attempt to remove them was made, he said.

"Those that write the rules just don't have the respect for those who have given their life for their country," Jones said.

"As far as I'm concerned this is disrespectful to those who have given their lives in Afghanistan and Iraq."

Jones believes Pelosi will make an exception for the memorial.

"When we're having men and women dying every day and every week in Afghanistan and in Iraq—my God, the least that we can do is have people walk by and see the face of one that never came back home," Jones said. "I think Ms. Pelosi will understand."

Jones sent a letter to Pelosi on Wednesday regarding the matter.

It has been suggested to Jones that a listing of the names of the fallen be placed in an entrance foyer, but he believes that to be insufficient, he said in the letter to Pelosi.

Jones said, regardless of her decision, he plans to stand his ground in the situation.

"We're not going to let this be an issue, were going to do what's right," Jones said. "I told them they'll have to remove me with the posters."

Vivianne Wersel, the president of the Surviving Spouses Support Group at Camp Lejeune, said the memorial is as much an icon as the American flag.

"These service members have given their lives for a conflict and something that they believe in," she said. "I think that it is a reminder for those that are visiting Congress and that is what America is all about. Whether my husband's picture is in it or not, it plays a role to remind those that walk the hall of Congress. They can walk the halls of Congress because of these young men that have given them the freedom to speak and the freedom to live."

□ 1930

HONORING THE MEMORY OF
WARREN G. DAVIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to first of all say how much I appreciate this opportunity to address my colleagues and the Nation and to talk for just a few moments on a good and decent person, a great American. His name is Warren G. Davis.

Warren G. Davis passed away a few days ago. He was more than just an ordinary person. God blesses us with many blessings. But there is no greater

blessing that he blesses you with than that to have a friend, a friend for life. And that is what Warren G. Davis meant to me and our friendship.

Warren G. Davis comes out of Texas. He was born out of Refugio, Texas, near Victoria and near Corpus Christi, a man of God from the very beginning. Warren Davis was a loving husband to his wife of over 38 years, Linda. He was a loving father to his two sons, Brad and Warren Junior. He was a loving brother to Fred Davis and his cousin Harold Martin. And of course his mother, his father and his entire beloved family mourns this hour.

But let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that not only his family mourns, his immediate family, for this young man touched many lives. In his community of South Lake, Texas, he played such an important role as a community leader, for Warren not only gave to his family, but he gave to his extended family and his entire community. He served on the school board of South Lake from 1993 to 1996. He was a member of the Red Creek Community Association. As a matter of fact, he served as its president. He was also a member of the very elite community group called the Dragons Council. It was no ordinary group, for this is an elite fan-based booster group for the young people in that community and supported the South Lake teams.

To show you a measure of his commitment, over the many years Warren G. Davis never missed a single game. He gave so much of his life to this community.

Warren Davis and I go back from the very beginning of our college careers. He has been a friend for over 45 years to me, Mr. Speaker, for in 1963 we both went to Florida A&M University where this young man was also my college roommate for 4 years. We pledged fraternity together, the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity; oh, did he love Alpha Phi Alpha, and we pledged the Beta Nu Chapter. We affectionately referred to ourselves as the 12 disciples. But Warren Davis was the enforcer of our group. He was the glue that kept us together. He learned very early to work with different people. He not only was there as a fraternity person, but also worked early in the student movement when we had the task of integrating many of the public facilities in Tallahassee, Florida, as we matriculated through Florida A&M University.

When he left Florida A&M, he started a very distinguished career in the computer field as one of the foremost African-American executives with the IBM corporation, working as an executive in the management and the market and the accounting areas, and paving the way for other African Americans to be able to follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great American and one who was humble and humbled himself before God and understood not only who he was but whose he was.

And so I just want to rise this afternoon to say these few words about my

great friend, my good friend, Warren Davis. Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Warren Davis fought the good fight. Warren Davis finished his course, and Warren Davis kept the faith. And henceforth there is put up for him a crown of righteousness which the Lord, that righteous judge, has made available to Warren G. Davis, and so many people both near and far all across the breadth and the scope of America collectively say we thank God for sending Warren G. Davis our way.

HONORING DR. MICHAEL DEBAKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor Dr. Michael DeBakey, the father of modern cardiovascular surgery, and for me a personal hero. Dr. DeBakey passed away Friday night in Houston at the age of 99. Michael DeBakey, a giant among men and a giant in medicine. His death is a tremendous loss to the fields of medicine, science, and technology. It is a great loss for humanity at-large.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain privileges that come with being a servant here in the people's House. For me, one of those privileges was meeting Dr. DeBakey. After working months to secure the Congressional Gold Medal for the great doctor, I had the chance to sit down with him here in Washington in April right after it was awarded to him. For 30 minutes, we were able to discuss his personal and professional experiences over his 60 years in medicine. It was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for which I am eternally grateful.

He talked about how Congress had been responsible for the advancement of medical science in this country, how Congress had led the way with funding for the National Institutes of Health. He talked about his experiences going over and treating Boris Yeltsin in the Soviet Union when he was suffering from heart disease, and Dr. DeBakey found just on the basis purely on physical examine that the individual was quite anemic as well, which rendered his outlook for cardiovascular surgery much worse. They treated the anemia, and the rest, as they say, is history.

As a fellow physician, Dr. DeBakey's work on medical advancements is legendary. His dedication to healing those around him came not only from his talents as a physician, but his ongoing commitment to the larger medical community.

His motto, as we heard others mention today, was always "strive for nothing less than excellence."

I would be remiss if I did not mention the education and the entrepreneurial spirit that made him worthy of one of the Nation's highest honors, the Congressional Gold Medal. Let me share some of his accomplishments.

While in medical school, Dr. DeBakey developed the roller pump

which later became the major component in the heart-lung machine that is used in open heart surgery routinely today. It was truly a visionary change.

His service and subsequent work in the Surgeon General's office during World War II led to the development of the Mobile Army Surgical Hospital, the so-called MASH unit. Without Dr. DeBakey, we wouldn't have those forward surgical teams that go into combat areas and provide vital care to our soldiers in that golden hour after injury.

This medical trailblazer also helped establish the specialized medical and surgical center system for treating military personnel returning home from war which we know as the Veterans Administration Medical Center.

But it was at the Methodist Hospital in Houston where Dr. DeBakey performed many of his groundbreaking surgeries, including the first removal of a carotid artery blockage. He also performed the first coronary artery bypass graft, and some of the first heart transplants in this country as well.

He served as adviser to every President of the United States for the last 50 years. Think of that, every President for the last 50 years depended on Dr. Michael DeBakey for medical advice. Additionally, he has given advice to heads of state throughout the world.

During his professional surgical career, he performed more than 60,000 cardiovascular procedures, and trained thousands of surgeons who practice around the world today. Today, his name is affixed to any number of organizations, centers of learning, and projects devoted to medical education and health education for the general public. This includes the National Library of Medicine, which is now the world's largest and most prestigious repository of medical archives. The collections there house resources that actually I look at several times a week as I prepare for committee hearings.

Dr. DeBakey's contributions to medicine, his breakthrough surgeries, and his innovative devices have completely transformed our view of the human body and our view of longevity on this planet. The United States, and indeed the world, were fortunate to have this medical pioneer for as long as we did.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I come to the floor tonight, but it is also with great honor that I once again share Dr. DeBakey with this august body. Time Magazine honored him as the Man of the Year several years ago. Indeed he was, a man for the ages and the Man of the Year.

U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, just 10 days ago we celebrated the 4th of July because on that day in 1776, we first declared our Nation's independence and sovereignty.

The American people have cherished and fought for that sovereignty for 232 years, so it is only right that we respect the sovereignty of other nations.

Last week, Iraq's Prime Minister al-Maliki said that the withdrawal of American troops out of Iraq or a timetable for withdrawal should be part of the current status-of-forces negotiations between his government and the United States. He insisted that the basis for any agreement will be respect for the full sovereignty of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this House should affirm Iraq's right to full sovereignty. In fact, my colleague, Representative LEE of California, and I have sent a letter to every Member of the House inviting all Members to cosign a letter to Prime Minister al-Maliki supporting his government's sovereign rights. The letter reads in part as follows: "We, the undersigned, Members of the United States House of Representatives, write to acknowledge and support the sovereign right of the government of Iraq to insist that any security agreement between the United States and Iraq include a timetable for the complete redeployment of U.S. Armed Forces and military contractors out of Iraq."

The letter goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "As elected members of the legislative branch of the world's longest continuing democracy, we recognize that it is the national legislature that is responsible for expressing and exercising the sovereign rights and powers that the people have entrusted in their government."

"It is for the free people of Iraq, acting through their elected representatives in the Iraq parliament, to decide for themselves the terms and conditions under which they will agree to the continuing presence of the U.S. Armed Forces and military contractors in their country. And it is for the Congress of the United States to approve the terms and conditions of any security agreement that commits the United States to the defense of Iraq."

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister al-Maliki's statement for support for withdrawal timetable could very well be the light at the end of the tunnel that the American people have long been waiting for. Ending the occupation of Iraq, which was never an imminent security threat to the United States in the first place, would allow us to refocus on Afghanistan where the real threat lies. It would end the U.S. military occupation in the Middle East that has done so much to strengthen Iran's hand in the region. And it would allow us to redirect tens of billions of dollars back home for desperately needed investments in our economy, our health care, energy independence, education, child care and so much more.

The President has often said that as Iraqis stand up, we will stand down. Prime Minister al-Maliki's statement shows that the Iraqis believe they are ready to stand up. Now the ball is in our court. It is time for the President

to prove he meant what he said because if the administration doesn't work with the prime minister in a serious way to withdrawal our troops and military contractors, it will prove what so many of us have feared all along, that the administration has no intention of leaving Iraq ever.

Representative LEE and I urge all Members of the House to sign this important letter to Prime Minister al-Maliki. This is a critical moment and a crucial opportunity to end the long, bloody, disastrous occupation of Iraq. We must seize it.

PRACTICAL ENERGY SOLUTIONS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for literally months now, House Republicans have come to the floor in a concerted effort to convince Democratic leadership to bring legislation to the floor that would allow us to drill here and drill now so we can all pay less at the pump.

But even as we offered practical energy solutions and a willingness to work with the majority, Speaker PELOSI has continually blocked such legislation from coming for a vote here in the House, and we are not the only ones who have noticed it.

Mr. Speaker, here is a headline from today's Roll Call newspaper. Here is what it says: "Pelosi maneuvers to block drilling votes. Speaker Nancy Pelosi appears intent on preventing votes on opening more areas to offshore drilling, despite the stirrings of a revolt by rank-and-file Democrats after months of concerted efforts by House Republicans." This was in Roll Call today, Monday, July 14, 2008.

As this article notes, we are starting to hear some rumblings from Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who are ready to put partisan politics aside and work with Republicans on compromise legislation that will start to decrease our pain at the pump. Increasing numbers of rank-and-file Democrats seem to have grown tired of their leadership's failure to allow votes on legislation that will break our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show a couple of posters here and some quotes. The first quote, "Americans need Congress to look at real solutions in addressing our energy needs, especially when we have \$4 a gallon gasoline. We need answers and not just slogans. We need to do it all. We have Senators going to Saudi Arabia begging them to increase their production, but we won't increase ours in some of the most, potential, productive areas?" That was a quote from a floor remark made June 26, 2008, by Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

□ 1945

Here is another one. Another quote, "Then we better get started, because

the longer we delay, the more we're jeopardizing the American economy." That quote came from Representative NEIL ABERCROMBIE, the gentleman from Hawaii, on Fox News on July 7 of this year, a member, NEIL ABERCROMBIE, of the Natural Resources Committee.

Many Members on both sides of the aisle understand that there is not one single solution to our current energy crisis, and that we must work in a bipartisan way to develop a comprehensive plan to alleviate the pain that American families face every time they fill their gas pumps.

I want to commend the leadership of Representative JOHN PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and, as I said, Representative NEIL ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii. They are now heading up a working group to form legislation that incorporates long-term energy solutions while also providing short-term relief for Americans who are now, today, paying \$4.11 a gallon of gas.

This bipartisan approach is what we need to find a solution. House Republicans stand ready to find a middle way that not only guarantees an increase in domestic production, but it also addresses concerns about excessive speculation.

While House Republicans are prepared for a comprehensive approach that looks not only at supply but also market factors, Speaker PELOSI must be willing to, at the very least, allow an up or down vote on increasing domestic supply. She must recognize that the American people don't want any option left off the table.

As further indication that we need to increase the domestic supply of oil, President Bush today lifted the 18 year-old executive order that prohibited responsible energy exploration along our Nation's Outer Continental Shelf. Let me show my colleagues that poster. Here is the quote, "In another push to deal with soaring gas prices, President Bush on Monday will lift an executive ban on offshore drilling that has stood since his father was president. But the move, by itself, will do nothing unless Congress acts as well." This was from the Associated Press today.

This decision leaves Congress as the last remaining hurdle to domestically producing billions of barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas for the American people. Allowing our Nation to explore the energy resources available off of our coast would be a great first step toward declaring America's energy independence.

We need to have a comprehensive approach, and I hope Members on both sides of the aisle recognize that, and we need action now.

Unfortunately, sound energy policy is being held hostage by Speaker NANCY PELOSI because she believes that it is more important to pander to out-of-control environmentalists than to enact a "common-sense plan" to lower gas prices—as she promised to the American people over 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, as American families and small businesses face record prices at the

pump, they are counting on their leaders in Congress to work together on reforms to help reduce fuel costs. I call on Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic Leadership to listen to House Republicans, a growing coalition of House Democrats and most importantly the American people—allow a vote on legislation that will reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

AMERICA NEEDS TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week's rattling of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and the failure of IndyMac Bank are the latest wreckage of our held-hostage economy enlarged to a trillion-dollar hole. When we think about what is happening, the seeds of the ruin were sown in the 1990s, and those who planted the seeds got rich while pushing America financially to the precipice.

The repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act by Congress in 1999 contributed to our financial system's vulnerability. For the first time in a half a century, the firewall between banking and commerce was breached. I voted against abandoning Glass-Steagall, but the act passed overwhelmingly in this chamber by a vote of 362-57 and over in the other body, 90-8.

As a result, the American taxpayers are now being asked to bail out Wall Street. The biggest high-risk investment banks and some uninsured government instrumentalities are going right to the American people, where they said they would never go. As these risky practices were standardized, the question is, what happened to the regulatory bodies charged with maintaining the safety and soundness of our financial system? Why didn't Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac exert due diligence and oversight? Where was Treasury's Office of Thrift Supervision?

What happened to HUD's appraisal and underwriting standards, when in 1993 and mortgage letter 93-2, and then in 1994, in HUD's mortgage letter 94-54, HUD gave authority to lenders like Countrywide to approve their own loans and select their own appraisers. Assuming many of these loans were moved to market through Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, why did their regulatory standards fall short? Who served on their boards of directors and voted for these high-risk practices? How much were those boards and executives compensated during those years when these risky practices proliferated?

Evidence is beginning to surface that many of those board members personally benefited from their own decisions. Well, through which domestic and international institutions were the original mortgage securitizations first moved? Which persons and which firms did it, and which regulatory agencies sanctioned the process?

Why did Treasury's Office of Thrift Supervision fail to bat an eye when Superior Bank, one of the first institutions to embark on subprime lending, was earning 7½ times the industry's average return on assets? Where was its Chicago Office of Thrift Supervision? When FDIC finally caught up and charged Superior in 2001, it was fined \$450 million, the largest fine in U.S. history much.

But why haven't other hot-dog banks been brought to justice? This subprime crises happened because people at the highest levels wilted, they placed America in bondage for another generation. The gaming of our financial markets is not a new phenomenon, but each crisis seems to get bigger, and the big fish, the kingfish, aren't brought to justice.

All the men and women who served on the boards of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae during the 1990s and voted for these high-risk practices should be investigated. They made millions off their stock options and industry connections. Are they to remain anonymous to the American people who are being asked to pick up their horse dung after the parade has gone through town? Who were they, and how did their votes, as board members, contribute to this unfolding American tragedy?

I am going to place in the RECORD tonight the list of all the board members at Freddie Mac from the early nineties until the early 2000s and will be placing the same names in the RECORD for Fannie Mae in future days.

Let me just say that the trillion-dollars debt that is being proposed to be financed through the sale of U.S. bonds, let me remind the American people, our coffers are empty as a country. Our country will borrow more money from foreign interests to close this gap, and our children will owe principal and interest to the bondholders, just as they paid nearly a quarter trillion dollars on the savings and loan crises from the 1980s.

Let me remind you the meaning of the word "bondage," a state of being bound, captive, a serve, subjugated to a controlling person or force, subservient, dependent, a bond slave, a lackey.

What is happening to our country is truly very, very dangerous. This never should have happened, and every single person responsible at the highest levels in this government, who did not regulate, who did not have oversight, who did not properly manage their regulatory systems in order to guard against this kind of risk-prone behavior, should be investigated, and the American people should know whose bill they are paying for. What a tremendous tragedy for our country.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman of the Board and CEO, Freddie Mac.

George L. Argyros, Chairman and CEO, Arnel and Affiliates.

Thomas Ludlow Ashley, President, Association of Bank, Holding Companies.

Armando J. Bucelo, Jr., Attorney-at-law, Law Office of Armando J. Bucelo, Jr.

John C. Etling, President and CEO, General Reinsurance Corporation.

Shannon Fairbanks, Managing Partner, Castine Partners.

David W. Glenn, President and COO, Freddie Mac.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company.

Barbara C. Jordan, Holder, Lyndon B. Johnson Centennial Chair in National Policy, University of Texas in Austin.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Chairman and CEO, Banc One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman and CEO, Great Western Financial Corporation.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman and CEO, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, Chairman and CEO, Dorman and Wilson, Inc.

Donald J. Schuenke, Chairman and CEO, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company.

Christina Seix, Chairman and CEO, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Chairman and CEO, Turner & Partners, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF MARCH 7, 1994)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, President & Chief Operating Officer, Freddie Mac.

John C. Etling, President & Chief Executive Officer, General Reinsurance Corporation.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company.

Jerry M. Hultin, Partner, Warner & Hultin.

Barbara C. Jordan, Professor of Public Service, University of Texas.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

Raymond J. McClendon, Vice Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Pryor, McClendon, Counts & Co.

John B. McCoy, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Banc One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Great Western Financial Corporation.

James B. Nutter, President, James B. Nutter and Co.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Dorman & Wilson, Inc.

Donald J. Schuenke, Retired Chairman, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company.

Christina Seix, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Turner & Partners, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF MARCH 10, 1995)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, President & Chief Operating Officer, Freddie Mac.

John C. Etling, President & Chief Executive Officer, General Reinsurance Corporation.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company.

Jerry M. Hultin, Partner, Warner & Hultin.

Barbara C. Jordan, Professor of Public Service, University of Texas.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, BANC ONE CORPORATION.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Great Western Financial Corporation.

James B. Nutter, President, James B. Nutter and Co.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Dorman & Wilson, Inc.

Donald J. Schuenke, Non-Executive Chairman, Northern Telecom, Ltd.

Christina Seix, Chairman & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Turner & Partners, Inc.

Dennis DeConcini, Former U.S. Senator from Arizona.

Harriet F. Woods, President of the National Women's Political Caucus, Washington, D.C.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF FEB. 1, 1996)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, President & Chief Operating Officer, Freddie Mac.

Dennis DeConcini, Former U.S. Senator from Arizona.

John C. Etling, Retired President & Chief Executive Officer, General Reinsurance Corporation.

Joel I. Ferguson, President, F&S Development Company.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

Jerry M. Hultin, Partner, Warner & Hultin.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, BancOne Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman, Great Western Financial Corporation.

James B. Nutter, President, James B. Nutter and Co.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Dorman & Wilson, Inc.

Donald J. Schuenke, Non-Executive Chairman, Northern Telecom, Ltd.

Christina Seix, Chairman & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Turner & Partners, Inc.

Harriett F. Woods, President, Harriett Woods Productions.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 1997)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, President & Chief Operating Officer, Freddie Mac.

Dennis DeConcini, Former U.S. Senator from Arizona.

Joel I. Ferguson, President, F & S Development Company.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

Jerry M. Hultin, Partner, Warner & Hultin.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

Maud Mater, Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary, Freddie Mac.

John B. McCoy, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Banc One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman, Great Western Financial Corporation.

James B. Nutter, President, James B. Nutter and Company.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Dorman & Wilson, Inc.

Donald J. Schuenke, Non-Executive Chairman, Northern Telecom, Ltd.

Christina Seix, Chairman & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Turner & Partners, Inc.

Harriett F. Woods, President, Harriett Woods Productions.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1998)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, President & Chief Operating Officer, Freddie Mac.

Dennis DeConcini, Former U.S. Senator from Arizona.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

Neil F. Hartigan, Partner, McDermott, Will & Emery.

Thomas W. Jones, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Salomon Smith Barney Asset Management.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

Maud Mater, Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary, Freddie Mac.

John B. McCoy, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Banc One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Past Chairman, Great Western Financial Corporation.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Legg Mason Dorman & Wilson, Inc.

Donald J. Schuenke, Non-Executive Chairman, Northern Telecom, Ltd.

Christina Seix, Chairman, Chief Executive Officer & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

Joe Serna, Jr., Mayor, City of Sacramento, California.

William J. Turner, Co-Manager, Signature Capital, Inc.

Harriett F. Woods, President, Harriett Woods Productions.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF MARCH 15, 2000)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, President & Chief Operating Officer, Freddie Mac.

Dennis DeConcini, Former U.S. Senator from Arizona.

Rahm Emanuel, Managing Director, Wasserstein Perella & Co.

Joel I. Ferguson, Chairman, Ferguson Development Company.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

Neil F. Hartigan, Partner, McDermott, Will & Emery.

Thomas W. Jones, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Global Investment Management and Private Banking Group.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Retired Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Bank One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Frontier Bank.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, President, Ronald F. Poe & Associates.

Stephen A. Ross, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Donald J. Schuenke, Retired Chairman, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance.

Christina Seix, Chairman, Chief Executive Officer & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Co-Manager, Signature Capital, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF MARCH 15, 2001)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, Vice Chairman & President, Freddie Mac.

Rahm Emanuel, Managing Director, Wasserstein Perella & Co.

Joel I. Ferguson, Chairman, Ferguson Development Company.

James C. Free, President & CEO, The Smith-Free Group.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

Neil F. Hartigan, Partner, McDermott, Will & Emery.

Harold Ickes, Partner, Ickes & Enright Group.

Thomas W. Jones, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Global Investment Management and Private Banking Group.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Retired Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Bank One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Frontier Bank.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, President, Ronald F. Poe & Associates.

Stephen A. Ross, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Donald J. Schuenke, Retired Chairman, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance.

Christina Seix, Chairman, Chief Executive Officer & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Co-Manager, Signature Capital, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF MARCH 15, 2001)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, Vice Chairman & President, Freddie Mac.

Rahm Emanuel, Managing Director, Wasserstein Perella & Co.

Joel I. Ferguson, Chairman, Ferguson Development Company.

James C. Free, President & CEO, The Smith-Free Group.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

Neil F. Hartigan, Partner, McDermott, Will & Emery, A law firm, Chicago, Illinois.

Harold Ickes, Partner, Ickes & Enright Group.

Thomas W. Jones, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Global Investment Management and Private Banking Group.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Retired Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Bank One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Frontier Bank.

Russell E. Palmer, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, The Palmer Group.

Ronald F. Poe, President, Ronald F. Poe & Associates.

Stephen A. Ross, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Donald J. Schuenke, Retired Chairman, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance.

Christina Seix, Chairman, Chief Executive Officer & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

William J. Turner, Co-Manager, Signature Capital, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF MARCH 15, 2002)

Leland C. Brendsel, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

David W. Glenn, Vice Chairman & President, Freddie Mac.

Cesar B. Cabrera, President & Owner, Rocca Development Corporation.

Michelle Engler, Trustee, Investor Series Trust & Member, Boards of Managers, JNL Variable Funds.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, L.P.

David J. Gribbin III, Managing Director, Clark and Weinstock.

Thomas W. Jones, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Global Investment Management and Private Banking Group.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

John B. McCoy, Retired Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Bank One Corporation.

James F. Montgomery, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Frontier Bank.

Shaun F. O'Malley, Retired Chairman, Price Waterhouse LLP.

Ronald F. Poe, President, Ronald F. Poe & Associates.

William D. Powers, Principal, Powers, Crane & Company, LLC.

Stephen A. Ross, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Co-Chairman, Roll and Ross Asset Management Corporation.

Donald J. Schuenke, Retired Chairman, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance, A life insurance company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Non-Executive Chairman, Allen-Edmonds Shoe Company.

Cristina Seix, Chairman, Chief Executive Officer & Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

Catherine L. Stepp, Co-owner & Vice President, First Stepp Builders, Inc.

William J. Turner, Co-Manager, Signature Capital, Inc., A venture capital investment firm, New York, New York, and Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Turner & Partners, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF JANUARY 31, 2004)

Richard F. Syron, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

Cesar B. Cabrera, President, Rocca Development Corporation.

Michelle Engler, Trustee, JNL Investor Series Trust and Member of Board of Managers, JNL Variable Funds.

Richard Karl Goeltz, Former Vice Chairman and Chief Financial Officer, American Express Company.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, LP.

David J. Gribbin III, Former Managing Director, Clark & Weinstock.

Thomas W. Jones, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Global Investment Management.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

Martin L. Leibowitz, Vice Chairman and Chief Investment Officer, Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association—College Retirement Equities Fund.

John B. McCoy, Retired Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Bank One Corporation.

Shaun F. O'Malley, Retired Chairman, Price Waterhouse, LLP.

Ronald F. Poe, President, Ronald F. Poe & Associates.

William D. Powers, Principal, Powers, Crane & Company, LLC.

Stephen A. Ross, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Donald J. Schuenke, Retired Chairman, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Non-Executive Chairman, Allen-Edmonds Shoe Company.

Christina Seix, Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and Chief Investment Officer, Seix Investment Advisors, Inc.

Catherine Stepp, Vice President, First Stepp Builders, Inc.

William J. Turner, Manager, Signature Capital, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2004)

Richard F. Syron, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Freddie Mac.

Joan E. Donoghue, Senior Vice President and Principal, Deputy General Counsel, Freddie Mac.

Michelle Engler, Trustee, JNL Investor Series Trust and Member of Board of Managers, JNL Variable Funds.

Richard Karl Goeltz, Retired Vice Chairman and Chief Financial Officer, American Express Company.

George D. Gould, Vice Chairman, Klingenstein, Fields & Company, LP.

Thomas S. Johnson, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, GreenPoint Financial Corporation.

Henry Kaufman, President, Henry Kaufman & Company, Inc.

William I. Ledman, Senior Vice President of Information Systems and Services, Freddie Mac.

John B. McCoy, Retired Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Bank One Corporation.

Shaun F. O'Malley, Chairman Emeritus, Price Waterhouse, LLP.

Ronald F. Poe, President, Ronald F. Poe & Associates.

Stephen A. Ross, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

William J. Turner, Manager, Signature Capital, Inc.

MESSAGE FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I bring a message from the American people. They don't like us. They viewed Congress as a body that's comprised of individuals that they elect and expect to reason together in the best interests of America and Americans. They don't see that happening. They insist they have had it with the politics itself and party.

Americans are hurting because of fuel costs which are pushing up all other costs, including food. Winter is approaching, and the pain will grow much worse.

This crisis is seriously threatening our national security. We are sending more money to foreign nations than ever before, many of whom don't like us, to put it mildly. We, in government, refused to get our financial House in order. We are forcing our Nation to depend on foreign oil.

Oh, and in an aside, emptying our Strategic Petroleum Reserve is not a solution. What if we are attacked, disaster? That's why reserves are called strategic. Politicians since, and including Jimmy Carter, have promised energy solutions.

Well, where are they? Under Carter we imported about 24 percent of our oil, and now we import about 70 percent. The American people are tired of hollow promises. They are demanding action now, now, not after the election, now. They demand plans for eliminating our dependence on oil, beginning with foreign oil, plans to use our own resource from offshore drilling to sugar cane conversion, all the while putting advanced batteries, hybrids, plug-in hybrids, wind, solar, hydrogen, nuclear and any other realistic alternative on a critical fast track.

Of course, we must do everything we can to protect our environment if for no other reason than we all must breathe clean air, consume safe food and water, and, of course, protect God's creatures.

The people know it's their government, and they intend to take charge.

Simply put, they are mad. Those before us, as well as many selfless heroes today, have and are now paying grievously. For this great opportunity that we call home, this America, the American people worked very hard to keep our Nation strong and productive. They do their jobs. The very least we can do as U.S. Congress is do our job.

OPTIMISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today on a lighter note, I would like to talk about optimism and the wherewithal that our country has, especially among our young people. I want to talk about a subject that doesn't really get a lot of attention in this whole debate about energy and oil and the fact that we are now faced with skyrocketing prices at the gas pump.

I want to talk about investing in our future. I want to talk about young people not only from my district but across the country, and I want to talk about what we call green jobs, green-collar jobs. Some people might think that's a misnomer, you know, but we have actually changed. Blue-collar jobs have, as you know, been outsourced to other countries.

What we are attempting to do in the Congress and something that President Bush signed into law just last December was an act that was part of the energy bill, the energy package, that said we are going to make a difference in this country by investing in America's future. We will provide 10 million jobs in green technology if our government steps up to the plate.

Now we are asking for that appropriation for \$125 million to help create, and, I think, minimally, 10 million jobs, that will be reaped across this country that will secure our energy security here at home. It will also send a steep message to many nonbelievers across the country that we mean business, that we are actually going to keep these jobs here, that these jobs won't be outsourced, that they won't be going to China and India and Indonesia and even to Mexico, because we are going to make an investment here.

It's, very simply, trying to set a precedent here to provide opportunities for people to get retrained or to get into new technology, into are renewable energy, into biofuels, and into creating solar panels. Those manufacturing jobs that we knew as blue-collar workers that my father as a teamster and other people in my district represented, could be retooled to help provide and incentivize our economy by keeping those jobs here at home.

No more of this minimum-wage jobs, but providing good, sustainable, liveable-wage jobs for working men and women and people that could rely on this to raise a family, not in the state that we are in right now, where you

have a single head of household, a woman, in many cases, that's working three jobs just to make that rent, just to make that electricity bill, just to get that extra gallon of gas to get to her job. Those are things that we know are resonating right now with our constituents, and they demand a change.

It isn't just enough to say that we are going to lower the energy costs, they have to have a good-paying job to provide for all those commodities, luxuries that they need to keep their family going.

□ 2000

And one best way of doing it is by jump-starting the economy and by supporting the Green Jobs Act, something that the Senate and also the House passed again that was signed into law in December. We need \$125 million to help jump-start that program.

I want to illustrate something here, a picture of some youngsters who were actually installing on a roof, who had just completed a project in Oakland, California, who were trained in a program, who went through an apprenticeship program that was done in a private and public partnership. It was to help install solar panels and to retrofit them in some of our oldest buildings in very dilapidated parts of our country.

What an incentive that would be to help to jump-start our communities and to revitalize those communities that have been left behind by the manufacturing jobs that went to other countries but also to incentivize those places that have high unemployment like in Oakland, like in East Los Angeles, like in the Bronx, like in Little Havana in Florida. These places need relief, and the government has an obligation to help provide an incentive, working closely, hand in hand, with private industry.

The reason I say that is that I know it works, and it's working right now in an obscure place in my district in East Los Angeles. The LA Unified School District, which doesn't always get honors for many things that they do, has invested in a program out of the East LA Skills Center to help retrain individuals. The majority of those who are participating right now happen to be middle-aged people who are saying, "I need to get retrained into a better paying job, a job that's going to help me in the rest of my life and in my retirement." They're taking that challenge; they're going through training, and they're being offered jobs.

One of the dilemmas that we're facing right now is that we don't have an adequate workforce available to fill all of these potential jobs. I say: Why? Why should we go outside and bring people in when we need to make those investments here in the United States and in Los Angeles?

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say and would like to urge my colleagues to support the Green Jobs Act and to provide that infusion of \$125 million that will act as a stimulus package for our economy.

NEW TRENDS IN THE GROWING AFGHAN DRUG ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing number of cross-border attacks in Afghanistan that are coming from the Waziristan region of Pakistan, it is more important than ever to develop a complete picture of where al Qaeda and the Taliban terrorists are hiding and especially of how they are funded.

Last month, the Defense Department finally recognized what many of us in the Congress have been saying for years. The report states: "Narcotics-related activities are fueling the insurgency in Afghanistan and, if left unchecked, threaten the long-term stability of the country and the surrounding region." It continues: "The emerging nexus between narcotics traffickers and the insurgency is clear. Narcotics traffickers provide revenue and arms to the Taliban while the Taliban provides protection to growers and traffickers and keep the government from interfering with their activities." In short, the Taliban has become a fully functioning, South Asian narco-terrorist organization, protecting the source of 92 percent of the world's opium.

Production is so high now that the price is dropping after years of record crops. Never one to ignore market forces, Afghan drug kingpins are now expanding into new illicit markets, and they have become the major supplier of the global cannabis and hashish markets.

Now, Morocco used to be the traditional main source for hashish in the world, but that is rapidly changing. Morocco has been marginalized in favor of Afghanistan. According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Morocco used to be the source of 31 percent of the world's hashish, but by 2006, the number dwindled to just 18 percent.

In contrast, the U.N. now reports that cannabis cultivation in Afghanistan has more than doubled since 2004. In 2004, 30,000 hectares were under cultivation. In 2007, that number had risen to 70,000, much of which is protected and nurtured by the Taliban as their new source of income.

U.N. figures also show that cannabis cultivation is surging in Taliban strongholds, including in the Kandahar, Uruzgan, Paktika, Zabol, and Helmand Provinces. If the Great Plains are the breadbasket of America, then these Afghan Provinces make up the production heartland of the international narcotics trade.

The U.N. report also notes that, in these southern provinces, all of the farmers growing poppy and now cannabis pay taxes of, roughly, 10 percent of revenues to antigovernment elements, including to the Taliban and to al Qaeda. Taliban presence is highest in

the provinces with the greatest drug production, and violence follows wherever the Taliban is present.

In the heroin heartland of the Helmand Province, the bloodshed is dramatically higher than in all other Afghan provinces. Militants launch an attack every 32 hours in Helmand, compared to just one attack every 3 or 4 days in the rest of the country or just one attack a week in Kabul.

The shift demonstrates that it's time for the United States and for our NATO allies to take a stronger stand against the narcotics trade of Afghanistan. Even the Defense Department now acknowledges a clear link between drug trafficking and terrorist financing, a concept that used to be very controversial in Afghanistan, but that is now clear.

Of course, in Colombia, we learned that drugs and terrorism must be fought simultaneously. In Afghanistan and Pakistan, we must take the lessons learned in Colombia to understand that counterterrorism programs will not work unless there is also an effective counternarcotics program to eliminate the Taliban's source of money.

Mr. Speaker, while partisan feelings in the House surround the mission in Iraq, the challenges of the Afghan mission are overshadowed. The Afghan war is sometimes described as the "good war" or as the "bipartisan war" or as the "war that our allies support." It is certainly true that our forces in Afghanistan enjoy stronger support from the American people and from our allies overseas. While we have a NATO command in Afghanistan, our strong allied support for this mission should not blind us to the growing problems and dangers emerging for our troops.

The reality is this: Heroin has financed the resurgence of al Qaeda and the Taliban, and they have now found a new source of money—hashish and cannabis—which provide, in our estimate, hundreds of millions of dollars to finance terror. The lessons of FARC's decline in Colombia are clear: To wipe out terror, you have to attack its income. In both Colombia and Afghanistan, that income comes from narcotics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKELTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CALVERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are going to do something a little bit differently this evening on the House floor. We have a 1-hour Special Order of the minority and a 1-hour Special Order of the majority. The minority leader and the Speaker have agreed to combine those two Special Orders so that both sides can participate in the debate about energy policy. I will be leading the minority side, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

ALTMIRE) is going to be leading the majority side.

In the first hour, it is my understanding that I will control time for both sides, and in the second hour, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will control the time for both sides. We are going to try to operate in such a fashion of cooperation which, I think, will be refreshing in this Chamber so that both sides end up, at the end of the 2-hour period, with equal amounts of time.

In Special Orders, you don't yield for specific amounts of time, so what we're going to attempt to do, between looking at the two clocks that are publicly visible and between the staff members who have clocks, is to make sure that we balance the time out.

So, before we get started in the actual substantive debate, I'd be happy to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania for whatever introductory remarks he wishes to make about the procedure.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

It is my understanding that this format has not been attempted since the 1990s, under Speaker Gingrich. So this is a recent historical event that we're engaged in here, and I really do appreciate the gentleman and the ability to work with him, and I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia and others for talking about energy prices and gas prices. That is what we're going to do over the course of the next 2 hours.

Again, just to lay the ground rules, because it is a Special Order, all time in the first hour will flow through the gentleman from Texas. All time in the second hour will flow through our side, but we want this to be an engaging discussion where we yield back and forth and ask questions and inquire of each other.

We're going to keep this above board. This is not a game of gotcha. This is to have a legitimate, honest discussion about energy prices, about the drilling issue, about the speculation issue, and about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

On our side, we're going to be joined by Members who have engaged on this issue, such as Chairman RAHALL of the Natural Resources Committee. Chairman RAHALL is going to talk about the 68 million acres of land that are available, an issue that we know about, and that will come up. BART STUPAK of Michigan, Congressman STUPAK, is going to talk about the speculation issue along with Congressman MURPHY from Connecticut. We're going to have Congressman HALL from New York, who is going to talk about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Others are welcome, who may be watching this as we speak, to join us throughout the evening.

Those are generally the issues that we're going to talk about, so I really do appreciate the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time. We're going to keep this on a balanced level over the

next 2 hours, generally an hour on our side and an hour on the Republican side. I look forward to the discussion.

So, at this time, I will yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

I am going to yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have before us, as we have this debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, a very serious situation. We have energy prices worldwide, certainly, but in the United States of America, specifically, we have energy prices that have gone up quite a bit in the last several years.

If you will look here, you will see that, in February of 2007, as to the price of unleaded gasoline at the pump, the national average was \$2.30 a gallon. By the end of June of this year, it was at \$4.07. The numbers that were given to me this afternoon when I got off the airplane show that, today, it closed at \$4.11 a gallon for gasoline, which is a record. For diesel, it's about \$4.82 a gallon.

If you will look at natural gas prices, which are used both in industry and to heat our homes in the winter and to cook our food year round, in February of last year, for 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas, it was \$6.60. By June, it was up to, which was the average nationally, \$10.21. We expect that, by this fall, the average national price is going to be \$12 for 1,000 cubic feet.

Now, if we sit here in the United States and do nothing, these prices are going to stay where they are and are going to go higher. The good news is that we have more domestic energy resources in this country than in any other country in the world.

To just give a comparison, on this chart here, the purple and the green and the blue are the amount of oil imports on an average basis per day that we're importing from three of our largest sources of imports. You can see that, from Nigeria, we're getting approximately 1 million barrels a day, from Venezuela, about 1,250,000 barrels a day and, from Saudi Arabia, about 1,500,000 barrels a day of oil.

The orange bar, or the red bar, to the right shows the estimates from the Minerals Management Service, the most recent estimates of the amount of domestic energy supply that could be produced at today's prices and with today's technology. If we were to produce in the Outer Continental Shelf, in the areas that are currently off limits but that we think could be produced in terms of a drilling program, that, by itself, equals the amount of imports from Saudi Arabia.

□ 2015

If we add the Alaska National Wildlife Reserve, which we're going to talk about in some detail, that will be another approximately 750,000 to 1 million barrels a day.

And then one of the big ones that we really haven't done too much about is

our shale oil reserves. We have 2 trillion barrels of shale oil in this country, and if we were to produce that, we think within the next 5 to 10 years we could have almost 2 million, maybe 3 million barrels of production just from that. Then if you add the tar sands, you add coal-to-liquids—which there's a lot of bipartisan support on the floor on both sides of the aisle—our heavy oil reserves, and then our CO₂ recovery with CO₂ injection into depleted oil fields, if you add all of those up, that's 10 million barrels a day equivalent of production that we could have in the United States of America.

Unfortunately, for most of these on the red bar, our friends on the majority side, on the Democratic side, certainly the leadership—I'm not saying that everybody on their side—but the Democratic leadership are not only opposed, but some would say adamantly opposed. And that's what this debate is going to be about this evening.

So with that as the opening statement, I would be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the Honorable NICK RAHALL of the great State of West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Thank you, Mr. BARTON. I appreciate your yielding, and I certainly want to commend you and JASON ALTMIRE, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for putting together this rather unique 2-hour debate, civilized debate, I might add, on our energy situation. It comes at a very appropriate time.

As we all know, President Bush just today by executive order lifted the moratorium that was put into place by his father some 18 years ago, I guess. That moratorium being on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf and in ANWR. And by a stroke of the pen, the President has lifted that moratorium, and I assume now that those lands are open for leasing; and I think that's a very important point to stress that they are not under lease at this time but are open for leasing.

And as the gentleman from Texas, I'm sure, is aware, having a lease in hand is not quite the same as starting the process to obtain a lease. The latter being a rather lengthy process that can take quite a few number of years.

I would think at this time an appropriate quote would be that quote from the Energy Information Administration. When commenting on the efforts to lift the moratorium on OCS and ANWR, it stated that lifting the current moratorium, "would not have a significant impact on domestic crude oil and natural gas production or prices before 2030."

That's the year 2030, 22 years from now.

This is the Energy Information Administration, a part of Secretary Bodman's Department of Energy.

And I think it's also worthy of note that 79 percent of the oil and 82 percent of the natural gas in Federal waters off America's coasts are already available

for leasing. That is today, now; not 22 years from now.

So I think that old saying that a bird in the hand is better than two in the bush, well, an oil lease in hand is certainly—a lease, the actual lease in hand is certainly more preferable in terms of gaining production today in the near future; that is today, gaining production today, and bringing meaningful relief at the pump today, not 22 years from now, but today, would leave one to believe that opening these some 68 million acres of Federal onshore and OCS lands that are already under lease that can go—the companies can go out and drill on today—today, not 22 years from now, but today—would, I think, be preferable. And I'm not saying not including what the President has done today, that's fine. He has done what he did.

But also I don't see—and I'm asking the gentleman from Texas this question since it is his time—what is wrong with requiring the oil companies to use this acreage, 68 million, that are already under lease to go out and make some, at least a due diligent effort towards developing those leases?

Now, I recognize that's like a housing development. You're not going to find something on every acre that's under lease. You already know there's nothing under a few of those acres because when you build a housing development, you don't build a house on every inch of that entire development. So there are some acres where there's obviously not going to be anything there and not worth exploring.

But of that 68 million, there's only about 10 million now that is actively under production. And if you extrapolate out the same Energy Administration Department figures I just quoted, if you extrapolate out what is being produced from that 10 million acres, then you come up with roughly about a 14-year supply of natural gas by extrapolating out those figures.

So why can we not give some push to the industry to go out and make an effort to find out if there's anything in these 68 million acres or not? They will say, I'm sure there's not. But how do they know that there's not? How do we know what exists in the OCS that is now open by today's action of the President in lifting the moratorium? How do we know—I mean, the word “potential” is always used. The potential for this large find or this potential. But I just don't—I'm asking that question.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I believe it's your time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. But this is a debate, and then I will yield to my good friend from Georgia.

First of all, I think those on the minority side would love to work with the distinguished chairman of the Natural Resources Committee if he wished to bring a bipartisan bill to the floor on permitting reform on the 68 million

acres that are currently available for leasing.

I think the gentleman knows that in the Energy Policy Act that passed in 2005, we put some permit reform measures in place on a pilot program basis. And in this Congress, there have been efforts made in H.R. 6 and then also some of the appropriation riders to put some roadblocks in some of those permitting process reforms. So if that's something that we could work together with, I would be happy to do that.

The second answer I would give on the acreage that is currently under lease is some of those areas, while they are leased, they don't appear to have significant mineral production even at today's prices. And as they asked the bank robber Clyde Barrow why he robbed banks, he anecdotally is supposed to have answered, “That's where the money is.”

Well, some of the areas that are currently not under lease is where we think the significant amounts of oil and gas are. But on the current acreage, I think we would be very willing to do an inventory bill, if the gentleman wished to work on an inventory bill. We could certainly do an expedited permit and reform bill if the gentleman and his leadership wished to do that. So there could be some agreement there.

Mr. RAHALL. Well, this gentleman is certainly no stranger to efforts to reform Federal onshore oil and gas leasing program. I've been involved in that for 20 years, I guess, through first my subcommittee chairman on what was then called the Interior Committee, I guess, and now certainly as chairman of the full Committee on Natural Resources. I'm not even adverse to reforming that process to make it more expeditious.

But I still haven't heard, and I'm still unclear, as to the fact that leasing is the more difficult portion of going out and drilling on these lands. Is that not accurate? Obtaining a lease, it seems to me, is a much more difficult—and you know, even before the land is available for leasing, for example, the land manager has to develop a plan to determine whether or not an area is appropriate for oil and gas drilling. Then once the Interior Department has made the land available to leasing, then the oil and gas companies need to secure the permits and do some preliminary exploration.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. But somewhere in there there's an option where you actually bid.

Mr. RAHALL. That was the next step I was getting to. They have to collect, analyze the data. Then the government has to put together an auction for the competitive bidding process and then award the leases.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And then you have a specified amount of time in which to make improvements on the lease and determine whether it's commercial.

Mr. RAHALL. Okay. Now, the 68 million already has gone through that

process. The 68 million acres we keep referring to as use-it-or-lose-it, that has already gone through that process we both have described.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. My understanding is it's in—various acreages are in various stages of that process. I think that's a true statement. I don't think it's all completed the entire process.

Mr. RAHALL. In any case, years ahead of the lands made available today by lifting the moratorium.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In some cases, that's a true statement. In some cases, it's not. There are areas that have been put under moratorium recently by acts of Congress that were closed to commercial production, especially in the eastern gulf of Mexico and the OCS.

Mr. RAHALL. But were they under lease?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. They were, is my understanding. And we then put them under moratorium.

Mr. RAHALL. Okay. I'm not clear on that whether they were.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It's something we can certainly work together on.

Mr. RAHALL. Sure. Sure.

Anyway, the point I was trying to make is that it could take years and years to obtain a lease, which these lands opened up today are just starting on that process. The 68 million under our use-it-or-lose-it legislation has already gone through that process.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Certainly the area that's never been leased is further behind that that has been in some stages of leasing. I will concede that point.

Mr. RAHALL. And in our use-it-or-lose-it legislation, we're simply saying current leases are generally 10 years. They vary somewhat depending on depth of water or where they're located. But generally, 10 years is the current leasing term. And if a company is holding that lease for 10 years and not producing on it or not even making an effort, showing some type of good faith, due diligent effort, as I'm sure the gentleman knows our Federal coal is required to do, other minerals on Federal lands that's owned by the taxpayers are required to do, we say in our use-it-or-lose-it, if that due diligent effort is not made, then you lose the lease and it's open again to competitive bidding. Another company can come in and make their bid for it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Again, we're very willing to work on some reforms to the current lands that are leased to expedite the permitting process and the leasing process, and hopefully those on your side would be willing to work with us to make available more lands that haven't yet been leased.

Mr. RAHALL. I think the major point I want to make is in our use-it-or-lose-it legislation, it's not an anti-drilling piece of legislation. It's a probe drilling.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I'm not aware that we've ever said it was anti-drilling. What we've said is we want to do

more than that. But we certainly support the first steps at some pro-leasing program on the majority side. We think that's a step in the right direction.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Let me yield to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) who is responsible for, or at least partly responsible for the fact that we're actually having the debate. It was his idea, and he was able to convince Speaker PELOSI and minority leader BOEHNER to engage in this.

I will yield him such time as he may consume.

□ 2030

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank Mr. BARTON from Texas for doing that, and I will have to give Mr. ALTMIRE the credit for persuading Speaker PELOSI for allowing us to do that, and I want to thank the gentleman for his willingness that we can do this and have a good discussion.

And while we're doing this, I would like to ask Mr. RAHALL one question: Can you identify any lands which are leased and are not being developed and currently who is not developing lands that they had leased?

Mr. RAHALL. We have that on a map on where these lands are located. I'm not sure I have it here or not. But it has been made a part of the packet of information that our Committee on Natural Resources did send to all Members at one point, and now as far as naming a specific company, I can get that information. I don't have it readily on me, but it's a matter of the public record because, as the gentleman from Texas has already said, when they go through the competitive bidding process to obtain the leases on the 68 million, of course, that's public knowledge, and these are public lands.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I guess I may not have posed my question just exactly right, but my question would be to you, this is a 10-year process. This is a 10-year process, and I'm assuming that each acre of land that has been leased, by whoever leased it, is in some part of this process of obtaining production or getting permits in order to produce. And my question is, do you know of any of the 68 million acres that are not in some process?

Mr. RAHALL. If they are, I cannot name a company that's not in any process at this point, but if they are in the process, that's due diligence.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Okay.

Mr. RAHALL. Oh, I'm sorry. Here, leased land not producing is the red.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I understand that they are not producing, but is there any—

Mr. RAHALL. Oh, you're saying they're moving toward production?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Yes.

Mr. RAHALL. If they are moving toward production, that's due diligence; they maintain their lease.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. So I guess my question to the gentleman is that

this 68 million that we keep hearing use-it-or-lose-it is actually in some stage, and I have a chart here that shows the different processes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. A very complicated chart.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. A very complicated chart, and I'm not going to attempt to explain it all, but I will say that the purple is the pre-leasing process. Your orange is the leasing process. The blue is the notice of staking process, and then the green is the application for permit to drill. And if you will notice these little red blotches on here, these are points of entry for people who want to start litigation during this process.

In 1992, the Democratic majority extended the leasing process from, I believe it was either 3 or 5 years to 10 years. And so I think a Democrat majority realized that this was a very burdensome process and could not be done in the time period that these oil companies have been given and extended it to 10 years.

So, you know, I just think that when we talk about 68 million acres, out of the 2.5 billion acres that are available that we could be drilling in, that it's not fair to say that, you know, use-it-or-lose-it, when the people that have leased it are somewhere on this chart trying to make this land that they have leased be productive for U.S. oil production.

Mr. RAHALL. Well, I would respond to the gentleman that, again, as I've said, if they are moving toward production, that's due diligence.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I understand.

Mr. RAHALL. And our legislation would not take that lease away from them, and you're right about the 10 years.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. But I do think if you do say the 68 million acres out there, that they need to either use it or lose it, and the reality is that they're trying to use it. They're just in some part of this process, and you know, even if it's the Corps of Engineers, I know there're several sites where the Corps is actually being sued, and these companies have to wait on the Corps to work through their lawsuit before they can get back into the permitting process. And then there's other stumbling blocks that they have to go through.

But I just find it interesting that the Democrat majority in 1992 was the one that extended this to 10 years because they understand that the trouble and the amount of paperwork and filings and permitting process that you have to go through, and then the same party would come back and say, well, there's 68 million acres out there that they're not using and so, therefore, they need to lose it when they are actually within the law, within that 10-year period, and as far as I know, each and every one of them that have obtained the lease are in some part of this process.

Mr. RAHALL. Would the gentleman from Georgia not agree, however, that

while all of that is I'm sure accurate, that is still on these 68 million acres of land, and that's still I'm not going to say light years but many, many years ahead of where we are on the lands made available today by lifting the moratorium?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I disagree with that because I feel that what the American people want us to do is to increase our oil production. I think that they want to see something like the gentleman from Texas talked about in 2005, that this government could come together and we could streamline. I mean, we've got enough smart people in our government that could streamline this process some to bring it about, and I know that the gentleman's in favor of that, and I look forward to working with you and Mr. BARTON to be able to streamline this so we can get production on the ground quicker.

Now, let me say that, you know, being from an agriculture State in Georgia, there's certain areas of the State that we grow apples. There's certain areas of the State that we grow cotton. There's areas of this country that produce more corn than other areas, and you wouldn't plant corn, let's say, in the north Georgia mountains because you wouldn't get near as good a yield as you would maybe in Nebraska or somewhere else.

At the same time, out of 2.5 billion acres of land, and knowing the area that's in the ANWR, and knowing the 2 trillion barrels of shale that are out West that we know are there, why wouldn't we open those up and give companies an opportunity to go out there? And it would not take 22 years to increase our oil production in some of these areas, and later on, we'll be showing a map of how much quicker I think we could get this oil into our refineries, which brings up another point, and then I will sit down because the gentleman from Texas has been so kind to yield.

But the other thing we need to talk about tonight I think is the increased refinery capability and the fact that, in our country, we've not built a refinery in 30 years. And we are right now importing almost 7 billion barrels of refined gas into this country and about the same amount of refined diesel. So, with that, I will sit down.

Mr. STUPAK. Would the gentleman from Texas yield on that point?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman. I just want to make a couple of points. Mr. WESTMORELAND seems to indicate that if we would just increase drilling somehow, we would increase supply and everything would be wonderful. But as chairman of Oversight and Investigations, we saw articles earlier this year which indicated that refineries were cutting back on their production.

So myself and Mr. SHIMKUS from Illinois, the ranking member, we wrote to

the Energy Information Agency and asked them: What is our gas supply? Take a look at the first 3 months of 2008, compare it to previous years. Is it a supply-and-demand problem?

Now, it's not a Democratic issue or Republican issue. The Energy Information Agency puts forth these facts, and here's what they said.

Gasoline inventory actually peaked on March 7, 2008, of 22 million barrels more than March of 2007. Gasoline imports were higher than they've been in the last 5 years when we looked back. Gasoline demand in the U.S. is actually down eight-tenths of 1 percent. So you have more than adequate supply, the most we've ever had in this Nation's history, at 22 million barrels in March of 2007, more than what we're using, but yet the price has still skyrocketed.

Now, I think all of us, Democrats, Republicans, we're all willing to put more supply forward, trying to increase production, and in the 2005 Energy Policy Act, that Mr. BARTON led that Energy Policy Act, I was a conferee on, we streamlined a way for refineries to produce more if they wanted to.

But you see from the Energy Information Agency, the first 3 months of this year, there's more than adequate supply. When it comes to diesel, we actually exported 335,000 barrels out of this country to Western Europe and Latin America.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. You do realize that we changed the EPA or the clean air requirements for diesel. This diesel that we are exporting to Central American countries, our government will not let us burn in this country.

Mr. STUPAK. I think the gentleman misunderstood. The diesel is produced here in this country. We could have used it here in this country because home heating oil took off. Home heating oil took off for the east coast. We could have used it, but to keep that price, to artificially inflate the price of home heating oil, we exported 335,000 barrels: 93,000 to Western Europe and 182,000 barrels per day to Latin America.

So, I mean, we refined it, we produced it, we had it all right here. But what did we say? We can get a bigger buck overseas than to provide a service to the American people. That's what happened, according to the Energy Information Agency, not me, Energy Information Agency.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, we need to get with those folks and see if we both can't get the same answer because the answer we're getting is these refineries are only set up to refine this diesel to a certain point, and because of the new standards implemented on diesel fuel for this country, that these fuels were exported to countries that can use that.

Mr. STUPAK. Let me keep saying, could you articulate these new diesel standards which made diesel not usable in this country? What are those new diesel standards?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, there are new standards, of course.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Low sulfur content. The sulfur content of diesel.

Mr. STUPAK. And when did those standards come in?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. They've been in place, and this is a guess, but about 18 months, 2 years. Don't hold me to that specifically.

Mr. STUPAK. So, well, when the Republican Party was in control then, in other words? There's nothing I can think of we did recently, and as the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee knows, Mr. BARTON and I have done a lot of work on this issue in the last 3 years. That's why I was surprised when you're saying new diesel standards. I wasn't aware of any so it must have been something that came back a couple of years ago when you-all were in charge.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I think they're being phased in, but they were put into place several years ago. Again, I'm not an expert on when they kicked in, but it's a very low sulfur diesel content. Now we have the cleanest diesel standards in the world.

Mr. STUPAK. I know Western Europe is very concerned about their diesel standards. In fact, they have the clean diesel, as we like to call it, here in Europe and that's why they rely more on diesel than gasoline. So when we export 92,000 barrels a day to Western Europe, obviously that diesel is meeting their standards, which are probably higher than ours. I'm making that assumption.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Their standards allow more sulfur content than our standards do.

Mr. STUPAK. Very good. But the point being, on supply and demand, at least when we look back at least the first 3 months of this year, according to the Energy Information Agency, we had more than enough gasoline, we had more than enough diesel, and it was just that we had to get that price up so we exported it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. You said that our inventory of finished gasoline peaked at 22 million barrels; is that correct?

Mr. STUPAK. More than the previous year, more than March 2007, that's correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Again, I could be corrected, and if we were all on the Internet, somebody could blog in and tell us because there's somebody out there that knows exactly, but we use approximately 12 million barrels of oil equivalent today for transportation purposes, which would include gasoline and diesel and I think aviation fuel. So 22 million barrels is not quite 2 days' supply.

□ 2045

Mr. STUPAK. Sure.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And that sounds like a huge number.

Mr. STUPAK. And when you take a look at it, what we expect our refin-

eries to do is refine enough for each day as we go along. And they did, and we had more than the previous 5 years ever. So if this supply crisis, as you seem to indicate there was, 5 years ago we should have seen it—4 years, 3 years, 2 years, 1 year. This is the most we've ever had, and they're claiming there's a supply problem?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. STUPAK. Sure.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The gentleman has kind of outlined the problem, but I don't think he has really quite explained it.

As he pointed out, demand for gasoline in the United States is going down—you said eight-tenths of 1 percent, I accept that as a number. In terms of barrels a day, it's about a half a million barrels a day it's gone down.

Mr. STUPAK. Sure.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The price of raw material product has gone up, as you well know, because of all of the hearings you've done on the Oversight Subcommittee that you chair so well.

Mr. STUPAK. Sure.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So what you've done is put our refineries in a squeeze. The price they can get in the market is going down because demand is going down, and yet the price they have to pay for the raw material is going up. So that has really squeezed their margin. And because we've developed this almost-just-in-time refinery system in the United States—again, using your numbers, even though it's at a 5-year high, and I accept that as a good number—it's really only a two or three day supply.

Mr. STUPAK. Sure. And I thank the gentleman for his comments because he's absolutely right. The refineries are getting squeezed. In fact, some of the smaller refineries are actually refining diesel and gasoline at a loss because the base price of crude has skyrocketed. And as the gentleman is well aware because he has attended the hearings we've held jointly when you were Chair, and now as I'm the Chair of O&I, it's the excessive speculation. I know that's the second half of our comments here tonight, so I look forward—but the gentleman is right. And that's why so many of the refineries and the Members who represent the oil patch parts of our Nation have supported my legislation, the PUMP Act, Prevent the Unfair Manipulation of Prices, that take out the excess speculation which is causing the base product, crude oil, to just skyrocket.

So I thank the gentleman for his comments. He's right. I would agree with him. And later on we'll get to talk about speculation, and I look forward to the comments.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Would the gentleman from Texas just yield for one minute?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Sure. And then I want to yield to Dr. GINGREY of Georgia, but we'll yield to Mr. WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I just want to point out to my friend that this cause is not, you know, the spike that we usually see is not some type of temporary disruption, but it's a demand from all over the world, not just this country, our demand has gone down some. It's not just this country. But if you look at China and Asia and India, their demand for this oil is going up every day. And if you look at where the world's supply of these imports that come into this country, if you look at Nigeria, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and then if you look at our ability and all the different types of untapped domestic resources that we have, we could get over and help ourselves by producing this.

And so, just like you said, it's not just the supply and demand, it's the fact that we have to import all of this when we have these untapped domestic resources at our hand right here for us to use. And I think that's the reason 73 percent of the American people are saying, hey, look, use some of this stuff.

And with that, I yield back.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to Dr. GINGREY—or I would be happy to yield to Mr. STUPAK for a brief comment if he wanted to make a comment.

Mr. STUPAK. I don't disagree with Mr. WESTMORELAND, what he had to say there. The only thing I would say is that's why we are saying we've got 68 million acres, let's drill or not.

You know, I come from northern Michigan; we have no oil, we have a lot of trees. And when you get a contract to cut timber on the Federal forest, you get your current year plus 5, if not, you lose that right. Because in order to grow our trees and have a prosperous forest, you've got to prune it out and we have to cut. Same thing with oil. If we want to access U.S. oil, why are they sitting on these leases when the leases have been approved for drilling and all the environmental standards have been met? And if supply is the problem, as you claim—and I'll grant you, that's part of it—then let's do it. No more excuses, let's drill.

You've got 22.8 million acres in Alaska that can be drilled on right now, but instead we seem to be focused on ANWR. I'm not even talking about ANWR, I'm talking about the Alaska Petroleum Reserve area, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve area, National Petroleum Reserve area. In Alaska, 22.8 million acres we could actually drill on right now today, permits are approved, everything is ready to go. Do it. Use it or lose it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I just want to refer back to the statement the gentleman from Michigan just made in regard to the 22 million acres in Alaska that you could now drill on, yet our Democratic colleagues, our friends, are denying the

opportunity to drill on 2,000 acres—not 22 million—2,000 acres in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, and to obtain an equal amount, an equal amount of petroleum from that area without harming the environment. It makes no sense to destroy 22 million acres for the same amount of oil that you could get out of 2,000. But that's another subject, and I look forward as well to later in the hour, when the gentleman is going to talk about hedging and speculation and, in his opinion, what effect that has on the price of petroleum that we're paying.

The gentleman from West Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, was talking earlier in his opening comments about the fact that drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, which we had been prohibited from doing—thank God the President lifted that Presidential moratorium, and now the only thing that is holding us back from going after those 20 billion barrels of petroleum and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas is inaction on the part of this Congress.

Now, earlier the discussion was about this use it or lose it. The gentleman from West Virginia talked about that a lot and said, well, you know, you've got these 68 million acres leased from the Bureau of Land Management—by the way, that's out of 750 million acres under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. These oil companies, my colleagues, they pay for those leases, they're not free. And so they're kind of betting on the come, they're hoping that their geologists will then tell them that, yes, indeed, there is a certain amount of oil in that area of land that they have leased. And if it's true, then they're going to go after it. If there is no oil there or if there is an insufficient amount of oil there and it's not going to be productive to spend that kind of money for a little amount of oil, then maybe they will sit on those leases. And I would think that they would probably gladly yield it back to the Federal Government—especially if they got a refund on their money, they probably wouldn't.

But these same people that realize that right off the Outer Continental Shelf, whether it's the eastern seaboard or the Atlantic or the Pacific or the eastern part of the Gulf of Mexico where there are trillions of cubic feet of natural gas and billions of barrels of petroleum, that's the leases that they want, that's the leases that they need. And it just is beyond my comprehension to understand why the leader of this House, Speaker PELOSI, would say that is a nonstarter.

Now, we could stand here on the Republican side of the aisle and say to the gentleman from Michigan and others who are concerned about noncommercial speculators and what effect that might have on the price of a barrel of petroleum, we could say, well, you know, for us that's a nonstarter; or you're interfering with the free mar-

ket. Are you going to do the same thing with pork bellies and wheat and corn and all these other things that are traded on the commodities market and regulated by NYMEX? Are you going to force them offshore by overregulating and interfering with the natural flow of market? So, you know, we have concerns about that.

But I don't think that our side of the aisle has said, my colleagues, that that's a nonstarter, that we won't even discuss that. And yet your leadership, Ms. PELOSI, the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. REID, has said drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, where we know there are trillions of cubic feet of natural gas and billions of barrels of oil, is a nonstarter. I think that's just totally wrong, that the American people don't want that. They want bipartisanship like we're having here tonight in this discussion, this colloquy between the two sides. And I think we can and should get together.

Mr. RAHALL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding.

You've mentioned ANWR and how much is available from that pristine environmental area. And again, I'm going to quote from that infamous Energy Information Administration of which I've quoted earlier.

First, this is a quote from President Bush June 9 of this year, "I've proposed to Congress that they open up ANWR, open up the Continental Shelf and give this country a chance to help us through this difficult period by finding more supplies of crude oil which will take the pressure off the price of gasoline. That was the President's statement on June 9. And his own Energy Information Administration predicts that the savings from drilling in ANWR would equal 1.8 cents per gallon in the year 2025. And that, coupled with what I said earlier—I think you were here—about the fact that these areas that the President has lifted the moratorium on today would not produce any major savings or even produce any oil until 22 years from now, it is not going to give us the relief we need.

And let's not kid ourselves. I think we all know in this body, both sides of this debate—or all sides of this debate I should say—that what we do in this body is not going to bring down the price tomorrow, next month, perhaps not next year. It takes not just increasing the supply side like you want to do, like we want to do in our "use it or lose it" legislation—that's a pro-drilling piece of legislation—but it has to be followed with follow-up efforts in developing all, renewable and alternative, fuels, which includes coal to liquid—

Mr. GINGREY. Well, reclaiming my time from the chairman—and I don't disagree with his last statement, it will certainly require a comprehensive approach; there is no doubt about that.

But the gentleman from West Virginia has said repeatedly tonight that opening up these reserves, whether it's the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, where we estimate that 1.5 million barrels a day increased production, increased domestic production—I mentioned the numbers for the Outer Continental Shelf in regard to natural gas and petroleum, and your response, your statement earlier was that, well, if you did that tomorrow, if you started that tomorrow, it would be 2030—I think you used that date—before any production of oil would be seen, and therefore, that's not going to solve the problem. Yet your colleague from Michigan is going to tell us in a little while how important it is to rein in these non-commercial speculators because just the anticipation causes the price of oil to go up or down.

And what I want to say to my colleagues is that it might take 5 years, 10 years, possibly 15 years, depending on where you're going after the source. Certainly, mining shale out in the west, where we could get 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum, may take a while. But just the fact that we're doing these things in a comprehensive way and we're increasing the domestic supply, I will almost guarantee you that overnight the price of a barrel of crude would drop by 20 percent.

Mr. RAHALL. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GINGREY. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It's really time to let the Democrats have some time. I think it's the gentleman from New York's turn.

Mr. RAHALL. Just very quickly I would say to the gentleman from Georgia about causing the speculation to end and go the other way, all these efforts would help, I don't deny that, but I think the most immediate efforts, what the gentleman from New York is going to get into now, Mr. HALL, and that is releasing from the SPR. We have it, let's use it. This is an emergency. And I think that is going to show the speculators we're serious and that's going to stop the speculation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan briefly and then the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STUPAK. Very briefly, I would just ask, whether it's ANWR or the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, would the other side, would the minority side agree and put into the legislation that all oil or gas discovered there or produced there would come strictly to the United States? Because what we see in ANWR and Prudhoe Bay, that oil goes around Laotian islands, it goes to Japan and China because it's actually closer and they get a higher price.

So will you say that the oil in Alaska will come for U.S. citizens to be used for American energy?

□ 2100

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman from Michi-

gan can get our distinguished Speaker to put an ANWR bill on the floor and let everybody have a free vote, I think I can guarantee you that we are willing to restrict that oil and gas to be used in the Continental United States or at least Canada and the United States and Mexico, at least in the North American Continent. If you can get us to get a vote on the drilling, I would bet we can get a restriction that meets your requirement.

Mr. RAHALL. I'd vote for that.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We will be happy to take that deal.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just briefly, I trust that you would offer a motion to recommit to do just that.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Let's get to that point, and we'll work. We'll talk.

Mr. HALL of New York. But I would just point out, going back a little bit, this map that I was holding up for Chairman RAHALL, the more interesting thing about this map, and I hope it shows up on the cameras, is that the purple sections here are all Federal land that may be leased and has not been offered to lease. Now, I suggest that the Department of Interior ought to take that—that's most of these areas. The red is the part that is actually producing. The yellow or orange is the part that has been leased but is not yet producing. But the purple, most of this lower 48 or western half of the lower 48 on this map, land available currently for leasing that has not been leased; so I would just urge that it be leased. No Democrats that I know are opposed to leasing, counter to whatever may have been implied out there.

I just want to mention that the one thing we can do that will have an immediate impact, and we're talking 5, 10, 15 years, maybe 20 years out before ANWR or OCS has an impact, depending on whom you listen to, but the one tool we have, that the President has, which was used by the first President Bush in 1991 and again by President Clinton in 2000, is the SPR, releasing oil from the SPR to increase supply. In 1991 it resulted in a price drop of \$8 per barrel, and in the year 2000, it brought down the price of oil by nearly 20 percent in a week. So I'm not saying it's the answer. I'm saying that it's a temporary thing and it's a tool that was given to the President by the Congress to deal with crises, which I believe were in one now, as our people are telling us.

All of us at home are hearing the same thing, I think, be it from parents driving their kids to school, commuters going to work, school systems that are barely able to afford to keep their school buses running, whatever it is, we need to provide immediate interim and long-term solutions. And one immediate thing that I think we should consider is releasing some amount of oil from the SPR.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the distinguished doctor from Georgia, Dr. TOM PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I want to thank all of my colleagues for working together to bring this evening to reality because I think it's what the American people want, and that is a discussion about what's going on.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about the need for increasing supply, and I appreciate my friend from New York's saying that the SPR ought to be released because what that argument signifies is an appreciation that supply is important. And supply is important. And that's what the American people understand and appreciate. They know that when there's an increase in supply that there's a decrease in price.

We have talked about how much of the Outer Continental Shelf has been utilized, and different maps and different charts do different things and demonstrate different things. This is a pie chart that demonstrates that the dark purple area is the portion of the Outer Continental Shelf that is able to be leased. And 97 percent is not, 97 percent is not right now.

And that's what the American people see. They see that we have got all sorts of wonderful resources that we ought to be utilizing, American energy for Americans, that we're not. The same can be said for on-land areas that ought to be leased or could be available for leasing. Onshore, the dark purple, 6 percent is that area that is able to be leased right now for oil and gas development, and 94 percent is not. And I think that it's imperative that we concentrate on that area that could be utilized by Americans. Americans are frustrated because they understand and appreciate that we're not using the resources that we have.

My friend from Michigan talks about the fact that we have got more than enough supply. I would suggest to my friend that Americans don't believe we ought to be gaining 70 percent of our supply from foreign sources. I would suggest to my friend that Americans want to utilize American resources for Americans and that that's the kind of work that they would appreciate our doing together on this floor, as we're discussing tonight.

So I hope that as we move forward this evening and talk about these issues that we identify that available energy, the resources that we have that are available to Americans. We don't have to worry about Hugo Chavez. We don't have to worry about folks in the Middle East. We don't have to be held prisoner of folks that, frankly, don't like us very much. We can utilize American resources for Americans. And I hope that as we move forward in this discussion over the next couple of weeks that we'll concentrate on that and have that as the hallmark for our solutions.

And I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I think my friends on the majority need more time. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

We're about to enter the transition, and I would just like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman to clarify what subject matter those who are here—I see some new faces. Mr. BURTON from Indiana has come. We have Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut, who is going to speak next for us. Are we going to continue talking about the drilling issue and continue along this vein?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I didn't know that we had a specific agenda, but certainly—

Mr. ALTMIRE. I just want to make sure the Members that are here get to talk about what they're here to talk about.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It's going to be energy focused. You're about to control the time; so you will be able to set that agenda. But we're willing to talk about anything.

Mr. ALTMIRE. It's our intention to continue this discussion. If we're able to transition, we certainly want to get into the speculation issue with Mr. STUPAK and Mr. MURPHY. And then Mr. HALL, I know, wants to talk about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We are willing to talk about all those subjects.

Mr. ALTMIRE. For the next hour, that's generally what we have in mind.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. If I could use these last few minutes to kind of straighten out a few points, at least my opinion.

Mr. RAHALL mentioned that the "use it or lose it" legislation was pro-drilling. And I had the chart up, and I thought we were in complete agreement that the 68 million acres that are leased are in some process of permitting. So that is not a pro-drilling bill. If it was a pro-drilling bill, then what we have done would have been to reduce the regulations to allow this to speed up.

And let me say this. We have not exported any Alaskan oil in 8 years. And what this brings to highlight, and I hope the gentlemen from Michigan and Pennsylvania will take note of this and the fact that we have had so many conflicting facts here. This is a good reason that we need to have committee hearings, subcommittee hearings, committee hearings, and open debate on this floor. The energy bills that we have passed so far have come under suspension. So there have not been any committee hearings on it.

Speaker PELOSI said, "We are trying to get the job done around here." This is her defending the use of suspensions. "And we work very hard to build consensus, and when we get it, we like to just move forward with it, as we did on the Medicare bill," which was a suspension bill we don't even need to talk

about. But this is not about a tool; it's about the legislative process and how we get a job done.

We have seen tonight and, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people have seen tonight that there are so many conflicting reports that we need to have committee hearings. We need to go through regular process so we can debate these bills on the floor.

The last comment I will make, in 1995 President Clinton vetoed drilling in ANWR. By today's projections from Energy, they said that we would be getting 1 million barrels of oil a day today. That was 13 years ago. We would be getting 1 million barrels of oil. And quoting Senator SCHUMER, from the other side of the aisle, he said an additional 1 million barrels of oil a day produced in this country would lower gas 50 cents a gallon.

So the gentleman from Texas sees these things, that we need to go through regular order and let your Committee on Resources have some input.

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would ask the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), is it your intention to continue the discussion that we are in right now, or are you waiting on a different subject?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. No, I am pleased to continue the discussion on energy and whatever aspect of it you would like to discuss.

Mr. ALTMIRE. So, Mr. Speaker, here for the next hour, this is where we would like to lead this: We will continue talking about the domestic production issue; then we will transition into the issue of speculation in the market.

But at this point I will yield to my friend from Connecticut for continuing this discussion, and then we are going to start the transition. So for those of you on that side of the aisle who want to wrap up that discussion, please feel free to talk as long as you want about that. But it's our intention to then move into the market speculation issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania and our colleagues from the Republican side for getting together and engaging in what has probably been one of the more productive dialogues that we have had in at least my short time here in this House.

I guess I wanted to offer just a few brief comments as a means to pivot to this next conversation because I think that you see Democrats, the majority party, focusing so much of our time on the issue that Mr. HALL will talk

about, which is taking oil currently sitting right now available in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and putting it immediately in supply on the market. I think you see us talking about what Mr. STUPAK will talk about, which is going after the very place in which the price of oil is actually set. As much as we talk about the oil companies and retailers, what it really comes down to is the price of a barrel of oil is set on a minute-by-minute, hourly basis on the commodities markets, the regulated/unregulated markets. I think you see us talking about those areas more than we talk about the subject that, quite honestly, occupies most of the time of our friends on the other side of the aisle because we see that as the means to immediate relief. I mean there is absolutely a conversation that should have occurred a long time ago and needs to occur right now to take this crisis that families are feeling and turn it into a long-term strategy both on the demand and supply side, changing the amount of supply and the very nature of the supply, changing the amount of the demand and the nature of the demand, to try to make sure that we don't get into this mess 5 years from now, 10 years from now.

But what we hear I know is what you hear. I mean this energy crunch doesn't discriminate based on the party you're registered with. Whether you're a Republican or a Democrat, you're paying the same prices in the Fifth District of Connecticut and Texas and in Georgia and all across the rest of this country. People are saying to us get us relief today.

So my estimation of why we have a disagreement at the very least on where the issue of drilling should fall on the priority list is because we just haven't seen the evidence yet that shows that this idea that drilling that will reach peak capacity in 20 years and may not start for another 6 or 10 years is going to actually lead to lower prices tomorrow or next week or the next month.

Now, Mr. RAHALL is right. We don't have all these tools at our disposal. We want prices to come down \$2 by sunrise tomorrow. It's not going to happen, and we don't have the ability in this Congress to make all of those big, broad, short-term changes. But what we are looking at is evidence that does not suggest that increased potential future supply is going to lead to lower prices today. I mean just look at what has happened over the last 6 years alone. We have seen a 361 percent increase in drilling permits. Now, there is no correspondence between that 361 percent increase in drilling permits and the price of oil.

Take a very specific example that we all read about just within the last 12 months and look and see how the futures markets responded to it. In November of last year, news came of potentially one of the most important oil field discoveries in the last decade, the Tupi field off the coast of Brazil. We

don't know how much is there, but the estimates already are you potentially have 8 billion to 10 billion barrels. You would expect, by the logic that we hear here, that that immediate notice of more supply around the corner with a government—there's no permit contesting here. There's no political problem that we may have in other countries. The Government of Brazil's ready to go. So we have got 8 to 10 billion barrels, and what do we see happen in world markets? Within 14 days the price doesn't go down, it goes up.

□ 2115

Within 6 months, a \$13 increase in the price of a barrel of oil and in 9 months as we stand here today a \$55 increase, the biggest oil field discovery that many of us have seen in the time that we've been in government service and the theory that that should lead immediately to the market's responding with oil prices decreasing doesn't happen. And so I think that is just a means of explaining why the oxygen on this side of the aisle gets spent on issues that Mr. HALL will talk about and Mr. STUPAK will talk about, the SPR and the commodities trading reform efforts. Because we see that as the most effective means toward immediate price relief.

And I think if we had evidence that the markets have responded in a different way in the recent future that potential future demand with increased oil permits leading to lower prices or new discoveries leading to lower prices maybe there might be a different discussion here. But the fact is that we haven't seen that kind of response. So I just offer that as a means to pivot on to some of the conversations that we will have on our side of the aisle. Because I think that is part of the explanation as to why you say see a difference in focus.

And I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Would you like a response to some of that?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I want to make a couple of responses. First, we will talk about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Under the current law, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve cannot be used to manipulate or impact prices. It is specifically in the law. It would take an act of Congress to change that. Under current law, the President has to find a, has to issue a finding, a national emergency on supply that affects the economy of the United States. I think as has been pointed out by Mr. WESTMORELAND, that would certainly be a hearing that would be worthy in the Oversight subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, perhaps in the Natural Resources Committee that Chairman RAHALL chairs. But under current law, we would not be allowed to release oil purely to help alleviate the pricing situation.

On the issue of this big oil field, I wasn't listening closely, but is the gen-

tleman referring to the big oil find off the coast of Brazil?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. That is correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. There are several things about that. We're not sure that we have the technology right now to develop that field. We certainly don't have the infrastructure in place to produce it or to transport it compared to up in Alaska where ANWR is within 200 miles of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline that is currently over at half capacity and where, as Chairman RAHALL pointed out, we certainly would have to go through the permitting process if we were to decide you could drill in ANWR.

But I have talked to some of the majors in this country. And they believe if we really adopted an expedited process for the permitting process, they could have production of about 300 barrels a day within 3 to 4 years, and they think they could ramp it up to about 1 million barrels a day or more within say 5 to 8 years.

So it's good news if Brazil has done what it has done. But because of where that find is and how deep the water is and some of the technological issues, it's not quite an apples-to-apples comparison.

Mr. GINGREY. I want to ask my colleagues if they would yield on another point the gentleman from Connecticut made, and that is, again, in regard to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Now it's my understanding that in that reserve we currently have about 750 million barrels. Is that what my colleagues agree on? And what would you suggest should be the release? How much of that 750 million barrels would you suggest? And as my colleague from Texas points out, we would have to change the law. That would be something that we could enact by legislation here in Congress. How much of that oil would you release?

Mr. HALL of New York. Well I think that is a subject for some discussion. And perhaps somewhere between 30 and 50 million barrels would be a good starting point.

But the most interesting thing about it is that it's one of the few investments the American taxpayers made that has more than doubled in value. In other words, it was bought at less than \$50. Most of the oil there was bought at less than \$50 a barrel and then would be sold for whatever it's going for, \$130 or \$140, the current value. So there's a big mark-up. And there is an opportunity not only to provide supply, to loosen up the supply-and-demand equation, but also to use the proceeds from that for some important things such as compensating those who are hurt the most. In the northeast with home heating oil this coming winter, there are many people very afraid about paying \$6 for home heating oil, truckers who are paying exorbitant amounts for diesel, or people on low incomes who can't deal with this, or for that matter investing in some alternatives to provide

some competition for oil, which, by the way, I think we should get to. Because what we're really faced with here is we're talking about drilling and drilling and where we're going to drill and what kind of oil and how much sulfur, and is the diesel going here or is the diesel going there?

But we're still talking about being at the mercy of oil. And I think ultimately this conversation has to come around to breaking the monopoly, the energy monopoly, that oil has in this country.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would continue to yield to me to ask a question of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York said, well, he wasn't sure, but maybe anywhere from 30 to 50 million barrels would be released from the SPR, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The purpose of that reserve is if the countries that hate us, and certainly many in the Middle East and Venezuela do, if they cut off the supply of oil to us tomorrow, we're talking about about 12 million barrels a day, about 12 million barrels a day that we would not have of the 22 million that we need. So releasing 30 to 50 million barrels of oil from the SPR would do nothing. And the purpose of the SPR, of course, is if we do get cut off completely from 12 million barrels of oil a day, we literally have about 60 days to utilize the SPR, and then that is all gone. And it's during that period of time, of course, that we would need to negotiate with these countries and bring whatever power to bear that we need, hopefully diplomatic, to free the flow of that oil back up. So that is why we say on this side of the aisle we can ill afford to release any of the SPR because of price manipulations in the market.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If it's allowed, could I give a factual presentation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve?

We have a little over 700 million barrels in the reserve. I think the average acquisition price is less than \$30 a barrel. They have the capacity to produce up to 6 million barrels a day at maximum production from the reserve. That then leaves at least 2 weeks to gear up to do that. World markets today are about 85 million barrels of supply and about 84 million barrels per day of demand. To really impact the price by releasing oil from the Strategic Oil Reserve, most experts think you would have to release at least 2 million barrels per day. And at that rate, you could release it for a year approximately, and then you wouldn't have any oil.

So again, it is worthy of a hearing. But I would be very careful about changing the law to allow the SPR to be used for price alleviation. It was a bipartisan agreement in the 1970s. It requires a Presidential directive of a national emergency because of supply interruption that is of severe harm to the American economy. That is the standard for release from the SPR today.

So to have a real price impact, given that the world market in oil is fungible, you would probably have to release about 2 million barrels a day. And if you did that for the entire amount of oil, you would have not quite a year's supply.

Mr. HALL of New York. If the gentleman would yield back.

I would just comment that it's likely should the countries that don't like us and would theoretically cut us off in a crisis would look elsewhere to sell their oil, and the oil would probably go on the world market to other countries, to China, to Asia and so on and would provide slack in the system overall worldwide which would enable us to buy similar quantities of oil from other sources. This is all speculation on our part.

But I would just say that it's not by any means certain that a cut-off of oil from a certain country to us would mean that we would not be able to get the same amount of oil elsewhere.

Let me also say, because there was a comment made before, just continuing on a couple of quick points, there was a comment made before, many comments about how the American people are hurting, and one comment about how the oil companies are being squeezed. I just wanted to show the profits of the oil companies since 2001 climbing from \$30 billion profit to \$123.3 billion profit in 2007. And this is just from 2007 to 2008.

Here is an increase for another record year of oil company profits in the first quarter of 2008, \$36.9 billion. So the curve continues to go up even as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said I believe it was, or the gentleman from Connecticut, we've had in the last 6 years I think a 361 percent increase in the number of leases granted and 668 million acres, which is either in some part of the permitting process or has not yet been drilled on, but is available for drilling in the lower 48 and adjacent offshore leases. No matter what we do, the oil companies continue to make record profit among record profit.

So against that backdrop, I think it's really important to consider such things as the geothermal system. I was personally in the trench next to a house that was being built, fastening these loops of hose, of plastic piping, that is going to carry a glycol water mixture 6 feet underground and enable a 3,500 square foot house in Cold Spring, New York, to be heated and cooled for the cost of one 75-watt light bulb. There are four buyers so far that have come to this development and have been offered a house. I think the base price of the house is \$350,000. In that part of New York, it's expensive. And that is what they're offering these homes at. Or they can pay the extra \$15,000 up front for geothermal heating and cooling. And all four of the buyers have come in with today's price of energy and said, we will take the geothermal.

And the estimates of the company doing the work is that it will pay off in

3 years. If it's a full-time resident, it will pay off in 3 years. If it's a part-time weekend or summer home, it may take 7 years. But these are the kinds of things that are here today. And it's not rocket science. It's plumbing. And it's common sense.

And we need to do this because we're at the moment an oil-based economy, especially for aircraft. There is no getting around liquid fuels. You cannot fly a hybrid plane any time soon. But there are many other places that we can find other fuels and other sources of power, not only for transportation but for heating and cooling our homes and our businesses and free up the oil for the purposes that we really need it for.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I see several of my friends from the other side who would like to speak.

I will yield first to Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I won't speak very long. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I really appreciate the information that my Democrat colleagues have been bringing out night after night on alternative sources of energy. I just learned a little bit more about geothermal energy than I did, and I would like to have that right next to my house.

But the problem, as I see it right now, is how do we deal with bringing the price of gasoline down, and what do we do in the case of a national emergency?

The former chairman of the Energy Committee, Mr. BARTON, was talking about what would happen if there was an emergency and how we would utilize this Strategic Oil Reserve. My concern is what would happen if a major supplier of the United States and the rest of the world could not supply that oil? Right now, and I spoke about this the other night, there is a lot of unrest in the Middle East. There is concern about Iran developing a nuclear weapon. And they have been working on a program for some time. Israel just flew a mission the other day about 2 weeks ago where they had over 100 planes fly the length down the Mediterranean that it would be to fly from Israel to Tehran. And so there is the possibility that none of us want to see occur where there could be a major confrontation over there.

If you sink two or three ships in the Persian Gulf in the Straits of Hormuz, you're going to have a terrible problem in getting maybe 20 percent of the world's oil supply to market. And we get a lot of our oil from there.

And so I think we ought to look at the long-term problems that we face in this country while we're converting to other forms of energy, which I agree with you we should be doing. But oil is going to be with us for a while. And we're going to need that energy, as you said, for aircraft, transportation, for trucks and other things as we make this transition. And during that period of time, we need to be thinking about

what we are going to do to protect this country strategically in the event of a conflict during this transition period.

And that is why I think that this bipartisan group that started meeting tonight is talking about trying to get everybody together to come up with a comprehensive plan to deal with the energy problem and the gas prices, that we look at that. We look at the problems that occur not only today but what might occur a month from now, 2 months from now, 1 year from now, or 3 or 4 years from now.

□ 2130

And during this period of transition when we want to move to cleaner-burning fuels, we need to have the energy here in America. I appreciate everything that you are bringing up, but I also am concerned about the security of this Nation. And right now we are so dependent on foreign oil, if we have a problem in certain parts of the world, we will have an even higher price for a gallon of gasoline. That is why I believe we should expand our drilling opportunities out on the Outer Continental Shelf and ANWR.

I appreciate this discussion tonight. I think we should be doing this on a regular basis.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman, and I know Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. PRICE want to speak on this issue. I yield to Mr. WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from New York one question. When he was talking about the profits for these oil companies, are they making 50 percent profit or are they making 30 percent profit or are they making 25 percent profit? What percentage of their sales is that profit? I am just curious to understand.

Mr. HALL of New York. I just know they have made the biggest profits in the history of any corporation in the history of the world, and that the CEO got a pension of \$400 million. There are certain things that to the American people look excessive. I can't tell you whether they are. All I can say is what it looks like, and I can say that my sympathy for the oil companies is not at a very high level. Hence, my likelihood to pursue use it or lose it. If you are sitting on 68 million acres, some of which may be in the process of being developed, but my understanding is that all or most of it has passed the permitting stage and is ready for the drill bit to go in the ground, and the drill bit is not going in the ground because they are waiting for the drill rigs, they don't have enough offshore exploration ships. They have enough money to buy the company that makes the drill rigs. Most of these oil companies have more money than most countries have. When you are floating that kind of money, I think there may be another incentive at work which is where is the oil worth more? Is the oil worth more left in the ground or pumped and sold into dollars because the dollar is going down. You can't invest it in real estate right now because

that is going down. If you put it in the stock market, you are taking your chances. A financial analyst inside one of these oil companies may look at the choices and say, let's leave it in the ground. Let's acquire more and more leases and pump it in 5 years when it is worth more. I want to be sure that is not the incentive that is driving this.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I don't think anybody has any sympathy for oil companies, and I'm not trying to say that they do. I'm trying to ask, do you know if they are making 50 percent profit, 30 percent profit, 20 percent profit, 10 percent profit? What percent profit are they making that relates to these high numbers? Is there a percentage of profit on there that they are making? And what percent of profit is too much?

Mr. HALL of New York. Well, that is a very good question, and a philosophical one, I might add.

I would say your colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) who sits on the Energy Independence and Global Warming Select Subcommittee, asked the five CEOs of the biggest companies when they came in, and I am paraphrasing Mr. WALDEN, he said, I am a small businessman, I am a capitalist, I believe in making a profit, but at what point when you have made bigger profits than you have ever imagined, breaking your own record for 3 years in a row, is there some point where you would think about lowering your price to your customers? Is there ever a point where you feel that way?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. If the gentleman would yield, and I don't know if you have a list or what, but it is a simple question. Do you know what percent of profit the chart represents?

Mr. HALL of New York. No. What this chart shows is all profit. I don't know what percentage that is, how much deeper the iceberg goes below the starting point, but these columns stand for profit.

And I think when national interests conflict with corporate interests, that is when government needs to step in. The question is, are we at that point?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Far be it for me to defend oil companies, but my understanding is that the profits in oil companies has been about 8 percent for the past couple of years. I don't know what it ought to be, but I know how you figure that out in our society, and that is you allow markets to work. I also know there are some significant increases, there are some major companies that are making 15 and 20 percent margins.

And the gentleman is right, it is a philosophical question, when should the government step in. I think the points that have been made are very good points to talk about the strategic petroleum reserve and to talk about alternative fuel and conservation and geothermal and the like.

My point would be that we on this side believe we ought to have a comprehensive solution, that it ought to include all of these things, and all of these things means utilizing more of the supply that we have, American supply, whether it is offshore, whether it is deep-sea exploration, or whether it is on-shore exploration. Or oil shale.

We haven't talked about oil shale at all, and I think it is a bit of a transition into the speculation discussion because oil shale has been taken off the table earlier by the new majority. And oil shale is, as many of my friends know, estimated to have 2 trillion barrels of oil. That's a hard number to get your arms around. But when you look at in perspective, 1 trillion barrels of oil is what the entire human population has used since we began using fossil fuels. And we, America, have 2 trillion, estimated to be 2 trillion barrels of oil in terms of reserves.

I do know when you take that kind of supply off the table, the speculators, those who look at how much reserve, how much supply is out there in the world, when we as the government take that off the table, that immediately jacks up the price because that is not even there. That is not even there to be talked about or utilized.

So I look forward to the comments of my friend from Michigan about the issue of speculation because I think that we would again give the message that we are interested in talking about all of these things and having a comprehensive solution.

I would hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle are also interested in a comprehensive solution and not a targeted solution that picks winners and losers and picks friends and punishes enemies from a governmental standpoint.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. I think the gentleman from New York had to step off the floor, but his chart is still up there and it says "oil companies reap record profits during the Bush administration." Now, my colleague from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) pointed out it is about 8 percent per year. Many of our parents and grandparents have stock in oil companies, and they are glad that the companies are doing well.

But I wanted to point out during the Clinton years, during the dot-com years when profits were double digit year after year after year, I never heard my colleagues call for windfall profits against these dot-com companies, mostly out in California and Silicon Valley, and then the bubble burst and the market corrected itself. And it will do the same thing in regard to this. Oil companies will not continue to make record profits forever. I want my colleagues to put that in perspective.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I yield to Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I wasn't here during that time, but I do

clearly think that people can understand the difference. One of the reasons we are talking about the urgency, as Mr. STUPAK will about affecting the commodities market, when you are talking about a speculative bubble on a commodity like oil, which is dependent on whether people can heat their homes in winter and stay alive and get to work on a daily basis, that the urgency about bringing down that speculative bubble is imperative on this body.

So I think the reason you hear so much commotion about bursting this bubble, and I wasn't here during the height of the housing and the height of the dot-com bubble, but the reason we are talking about the urgency of pressing government action to bring down the price to something that resembles the laws of supply and demand is because of the life-altering nature of the product that we are talking about.

Mr. ALTMIRE. We have approximately half an hour remaining in the debate.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Before I get into speculation, because we want to address speculation, but because my friends on your side keep saying it is only an 8-percent increase in oil company profits. I agree, it might be 8 percent from 2006 to 2007, but when you make \$118 billion, the most ever of any corporation, to top it the next year is pretty darn hard.

But 8 percent on \$118 billion is \$123 billion, where 5 years ago they were at \$30 billion. They doubled it in 2003 and went to \$60 billion. That is a 50 percent increase. Then you go to \$82 billion, and I am no math major, but that is about a 25 percent increase. And then from \$82 billion to \$109 billion, that is a 20 percent or 21 percent increase. And then \$118 billion, I guess they had a bad year, they only made \$8 billion more than the previous record year. That might be 8 percent.

But look at these numbers, they are staggering. They are absolutely staggering. That is why we think on this side of the aisle you have to have a short-term policy and a long-term policy, and how to lower those excess profits from the \$118 billion, or the \$36 billion we have seen already in the first quarter of 2008, there is just no way to justify the doubling of prices based on supply and demand. Oil company profits are excessive, and we think speculation is part of the reason.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, I agree those are big numbers. What those numbers don't tell us is what kind of money they used to invest and what those margins were. And I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. STUPAK. Cut the investment malarkey argument. This is profits. This is after you deduct your investments. I don't care if it is on geothermal or wind or solar, after you do all of these and pay your executive a

\$400 million pension, they still make \$123 billion. I'm sorry, but I just can't find any sympathy in my heart with those numbers.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If there were an investment of \$120 billion, and I don't know what it was, then the margin would be a percentage and that is what you determine what the actual profits are.

Mr. STUPAK. Of all of the corporations in the history of the world, these are the biggest after all of their investments.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. In absolute numbers, you are absolutely correct. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. STUPAK. What I'm saying is why don't you invest more. What I'm saying in my role as chairman of the Oversight Investigations Subcommittee, and for 3 years holding hearings in this area, let's end the excessive speculation in the market that runs up the basic price of crude that results in these record profits because corporations, not only do they have a responsibility to their shareholders, they also have a responsibility to this country to be a corporate citizen.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And I agree.

Mr. STUPAK. Because high energy costs kill our economy. Every aspect of our economy is being strangled while they make record profits and pay obscene pensions to their CEOs.

So I believe one of the ways we can in the short term bring down these prices is take out the excessive speculation.

If you take a look at it, the Government Accountability Office released its report on the ability of the Commodities Futures Trading Commission to properly monitor the energy markets, to monitor what they are making here. What they said, the GAO said they found that the volume of trading in energy commodities has skyrocketed, exploded, especially after 2002 when we enacted the Enron loophole.

The GAO also found that while trading has doubled since 2002, notice that's when the profits start doubling, in 2002, the number of staff to actually monitor what is going on in the markets has declined.

If you take a look at this chart here, if you will, this is the evolution of speculation, trading on west Texas intermediate crude, average open interest on NYMEX long and short positions.

Between September 2003 and May 2008, traders holding crude oil contracts jumped from 714 to more than 3 million contracts. That is a 425 percent increase in trading oil futures.

□ 2145

Since 2003, the commodity index speculation has increased 1900 percent. It used to be a \$13 billion market, now, today, it's a \$260 billion market. By Lehman Brothers estimate, that 1,900 percent increase in commodity index speculation has inflated the price of crude oil by \$37. Other experts say it could be even more.

So on June 23, as chairman of Oversight Investigations of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I held my sixth hearing on gas prices over the past 2 years, Fadel Gheit, the managing director and senior oil analyst at Oppenheimer & Company testified, and I quote, he said "I firmly believe that the current record oil price in excess of \$135 per barrel is inflated. I believe, based on supply and demand fundamentals, crude oil should not be above \$60 a barrel.

We are at over \$136 per barrel today. It should be no more than 60, says Mr. Gheit. In 2002, here is what is happening. Over here on the yellow side, these are the commercial hedgers. These are the airline industries, these are trucking companies, these are the Big Oil users. They want to hedge.

The blue area, pink area or blue area here, purple area, that's the non-hedgers. They have no interest in hedging; they are just in to play the market. Sixty-three percent in 2000 were legitimate hedgers, 22—about 37 percent—were not. Come fast track April 2008, the legitimate hedgers are down to 30 percent, the swap dealers and the noncommercial, if you will, are 70 percent of the market.

So what's happened? By April 2008 the physical hedgers only controlled 29 percent of the market, those who really do need the supply. What we now know is that approximately 71 percent of the market is taken over by swap dealers and speculators, a considerable majority who have no physical interest in the market. Over the past 8 years, there has been a dramatic shift of physical hedgers continuing to represent a smaller and smaller portion of the market.

NYMEX, we have talked about the that tonight, New York Mercantile Exchange, has granted 117 hedging exemptions since 2006 for the West Texas intermediate crude oil contracts, many of which are for swap dealers without any physical hedging position. This excessive speculation is a significant factor in the price Americans are paying for gasoline, diesel and home heating oil. Even the executives of major oil companies recognize this.

At a May 21, 2008, Senate judiciary hearing, Shell Oil President John Hofmeister agreed that the price of crude oil has been inflated, saying that the proper range for oil prices should be somewhere between \$35 and \$65 a barrel.

In May of 2008, the IMF, the International Monetary Fund, compared the price of crude oil over the past 30 years, crude oil for the past 30 years, to the price of gold. Gold prices are not dependent upon supply and demand and have been viewed as a highly speculative commodity. The IMF's analysis shows us that crude oil prices track increases in gold prices. The big spike right here, that's the oil embargo.

Look what happened as soon as you had the oil embargo in the late 1970s there, mid 1970s there, gold shot way

up. Look at the track, look at the last 5 years of gold how they go hand in hand one over the other. What this really means is that oil has been transformed from an energy source into a financial asset like gold, where much of the buying and selling is driven by speculators instead of producers and consumers. Oil has morphed, has morphed from a commodity into a financial asset traded for its speculative value instead of its energy value.

Even the Saudi oil minister has argued that high oil prices are due to excessive speculation in the market. Former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich noted on National Public Radio a few weeks ago, the problem is government's failure to curb excessive speculation.

Now, the Commodities Future Trading Commission has the authority to set position limits and to take other action necessary to curb excessive speculation. Unfortunately, they have not done it. There are significant loopholes that exempt trading from these protections against excessive speculation. You have the Enron loophole, you have the Foreign Boards of Trade, no action letters, issued by the Commodities Future Trading Commission.

You have the swaps loophole, you have the bona fide hedging exemption. While the recently passed farm bill that both Democrats and Republicans voted for and overrode President Bush's veto addressed the Enron loophole for electronic trading, only for natural gas, a significant portion of the energy continues to be exempt from any commodities future trade action to curb excessive speculation.

As I said earlier, for 3 years I have looked at excessive speculation in the energy markets. In my latest bill to prevent the unfair manipulation of prices, the PUMP Act, H.R. 6330, would end or take away all these exemptions, to ensure that excessive speculation is not driving these markets beyond the fundamentals of supply and demand.

We would crack down. The PUMP Act is the most comprehensive energy bill, and we would crack down on energy speculation through a bilateral trade, we would address that. We would take the Foreign Boards of Trade, and we would clarify the CFTC's jurisdiction over these Foreign Boards of Trade. The PUMP Act would give the CFTC the authority over the exchanges, if they are using computers here in the United States, or they are trading energy commodities that provide for delivery point in the United States.

The swaps loophole that we talked about over here, that would be closed, you see, 32 percent right now, right now our swap dealers would close that loophole because there is no requirement for position limits. These swaps have grown exponentially, driving up the price of crude. By limiting this exemption, swaps would be subject to position limits to prevent excessive legislation.

Bona fide hedging exemption, those who really need to have supply of oil, we would make sure that they are, we would limit businesses to hedge their legitimate anticipated business needs.

I have trouble with the Harvard University needing a legitimate hedging exemption, which they certainly enjoy right now. What does Harvard University need to hedge on oil? The PUMP Act would also clarify that legitimate anticipated business needs does not mean energy speculators. Strong aggregate position, you have the NYMEX, you have the Intercontinental Exchange and now you have the Dubai exchange coming on. If you are going to have a limit, position, limit the position, it should apply to all three of the, the aggregate of all three, not just one or two.

So if you see, if we would close these loopholes and set strong aggregate position limits, the Commodities Future Trading Commission would be better able to monitor trades to prevent market manipulation and help eliminate unreasonable inflation of energy prices caused by excessive speculation to help out the American people.

If you don't believe excessive speculation is causing a problem, look at today's business news, especially in the New York Times, they are talking about home heating oil. And at our June 23 hearing that we held, Oversight Investigation, we had the home heating oil companies there. On that day home heating oil was \$3.98 a gallon.

Three days later, 3 days later I introduced the PUMP Act in the Senate with Senator CANTWELL. Home heating oil then jumped to \$4.60 a gallon. If you want to lock in, or if you want to hedge, you want to hedge your home heating costs for this winter, it's \$5.60 a gallon, a 20 percent increase in about 4 or 5 days. That's excessive speculation gone wild.

Our PUMP Act has 60 cosponsors, bipartisan piece of legislation, endorsed by agriculture, airline, labor, industry groups, trucking industry. So I urge my colleagues in this House, and I have enjoyed this discussion here tonight, to take seriously a look at excessive speculation.

When they testified on June 23 in our committee, I know Mr. BARTON was there and some others in this room tonight. Mr. Masters, Professor Greenberger, Fadel Gheit and others all indicated that if we would pass the PUMP Act the way it is right now, the most comprehensive legislation on excessive speculation, we could lower the cost of oil, of a barrel of oil coming into this country, by 50 percent, they said, within the next 30 days.

I believe it might be 30 to 50 percent, but the point being, in the short-term, as we started this discussion, we could do something right now. I would take the excess of speculation, all markets, all commodities, be liquidated, although they will need some speculation.

But when the physical hedgers are 2-1 being outbid by the swap dealers and

the noncommercial people, the floor traders that manage money, the nonreportables, then we have a market that has been turned upside down, and we have turned supply and demand into really a financial asset and not really looking at the needs of the American people, or the U.S. economy.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman. With approximately 15 minutes remaining, my friends on the other side, to achieve balance, have about 10 of that remaining 15 minutes.

I would yield at this point to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thought we had about 12 minutes, 12 minutes, so it's about 12-3.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Okay, 12 minutes to the remaining 15. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Let me make a couple of comments about what my good friend Mr. STUPAK just said.

First, in terms of speculation, I think that most Republicans would agree that there is some speculation in the market. I certainly believe there is. I held hearings when I was full committee chairman in the last Congress and you, Mr. STUPAK, have done an excellent job in that hearing that he referred to, I think, on June 23.

Some of the things that are in his PUMP bill and some things that are in the bill that I have introduced and Chairman DINGELL has introduced, we are going to have a markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee on a bipartisan basis sometime next week and hopefully come to a bipartisan agreement about what to do on speculation, putting some position limits, bringing the foreign exchanges under rules that the U.S. exchanges have to go by, creating a two-tiered system where physical traders play by a different set of rules in terms of margin requirement than people that don't take physical possession or provide for physical delivery. There are a number of issues we have agreement on, and we will be working together.

I might also point out that the gentleman's chart that shows the tracking of oil and gold, that is a, to me, a disconcerting chart, because what it shows to me—and I am not an economist—but we have taken oil from a commercial commodity that had value because of the end use that it could be put to, to a commodity that now has become a value of storage like gold. I mean, there is not a big commercial demand for gold in terms of jewelry and dental work.

Gold is basically—has historically been a hedge against inflation, and what the world financial community has decided with oil, because of the tightness of the market, since it is almost a necessity in the modern age, it, too, has now become a store of value, and it has a value applied to it above and beyond the commercial value of being used.

If we really want to do something to dampen speculation, and, again, we are

going to work with Mr. STUPAK on a speculation bill, we have got to fundamentally change the supply and demand tightness. Right now, world available supply is about 85 million barrels a day. World demand is about 84 million barrels a day. That supply number, that 85 million barrel a day number hasn't changed significantly in the last 3 years, because most of our major oil fields are growing older, the war in Iraq.

I could say corruption in some of the national oil companies, I won't name names, but even with these high prices, we haven't seen that supply and demand tightness go away. We have got to get either the demand down or the supply up, and, so, some of the things that the Republicans are talking about to increase domestic supply would help on the speculation side.

My final comment, before I yield back to the majority side for some time, is that in terms of the oil company profits, apparently the gentleman from New York, who is no longer on the floor, has made a big deal about how high these profits are.

Well, let me make a couple of comments. If you can't make money at \$130 a barrel, you don't deserve to be in business. I mean, we would expect profits to be up when the price is up where it is. Believe it or not, there are some of these nationalized oil companies whose profits have not gone up.

Now, one can speculate as to why that is, but in the United States we have a transparent market-based system and our oil companies are not price setters, they are price takers. If the world market is \$130 a barrel or \$140 a barrel, our national—our private oil companies take that price. Now, the question is, how do we want them to use those profits?

Let's unlock these reserves, these domestic resources, 85 percent of the OCS has been off limits? We can't drill in Alaska where we think there is a 10 billion barrel oil field in ANWR? Let's allow our private companies to invest those profits in American-made energy.

□ 2200

Increase that supply demand balance so that, as the supply goes up, the price goes down.

Now, having said that, I agree with Chairman STUPAK in that we need to do something on speculation. I don't agree with everything in his pump bill, but I do agree with probably 75 percent of it.

In the committee markup of the Energy and Commerce Committee that Chairman DINGELL has announced to me—and I, hopefully, will publicly announce it soon if he has not already—you will see bipartisan agreement. We have to live within the market structure of the United States and the regulatory structure through the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and through the Securities & Exchange Commission. Certainly, we can do some things to do something on speculation, but if we don't change the fundamental

tightness in the supply and demand situation, all of the speculation bills in the world are not going to make that much difference.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas.

On the point that the gentleman just made, I would yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and then to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE.

The point is that I think we would all have a slight degree more comfort with these numbers if we had confidence that those companies were investing back into capital, into exploration, into drilling a commensurate amount in comparison to what they're making in pure profit. I don't have the figures in front of me. I would be happy to see something that displays this to the contrary, but what I have seen is that you have not seen a corresponding increase in capital reinvestment—Mr. STUPAK may know this and may want to comment on this as well—as you have seen in returns back to shareholders.

Now, everybody wants shareholders to do well here. We want there to be enough excess profit to make some of the people who have invested in these companies do all right, but I'd like to also see some evidence, as you have suggested, Mr. BARTON, that there's a willingness to take a piece of that money and to put it into more drilling and into more exploration and into more supply.

I'd be happy to yield to Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. STUPAK. Thank you.

On that point, there is some skepticism on the majority side that somehow we're going to drill our way out of this or that somehow we'll just increase supplies, because if you take a look at it right now, according to government statistics, 82 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is available for drilling for gas. Seventy-nine percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is available for oil exploration and is leased. The last time was in 2006. We went along with it. We voted to extend in 2006, not even 2 years ago, more of the Outer Continental Shelf for oil and gas exploration.

What happened between 2006 and 2008? Profits kept going up. Costs kept going up. We didn't see a tangible result.

So, when you have 82 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf already available for leasing for natural gas and when you have 79 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf available for oil already available for leasing and as we had just relaxed the standards in 2006 and you do it 2 years later to get the last—what?—18 percent, 21 percent, how is that going to change the costs we're paying at the pump? How is that going to come down? We don't see the investment of these record profits into getting that oil up.

In fact, we're saying use it or lose it. You have record profits. You have more of the Outer Continental Shelf than ever in the Nation's history available for exploration, and you're not doing it. So use it or lose it. So that's why we look at speculation as, maybe, one way to bring it down.

I thank Mr. BARTON for his willingness to work with us on speculation legislation. At my June 23rd hearing on excessive speculation in the market, he was actively engaged in that, and he asked a number of good questions. I agree that we might not agree on 100 percent of the PUMP Act, but I think there is enough common ground there, and I've enjoyed the discussions we've had in recent weeks on the PUMP Act. Hopefully, we can do something. I've really enjoyed the discussion here tonight.

I thank Mr. ALTMIRE and others for having this discussion because I think it has been a good discussion. We've had some disagreements, yes, but I think it's all fair in what we're trying to do and in how we view things, and we are looking at the short term, what we need in the short term and in the long term, and I think there is more agreement than disagreement between the two sides.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

With approximately 6 minutes left, to achieve balance, the Republicans can control the rest of the time. We will certainly answer any questions, but I will say to the gentleman from Georgia: Have at it. The time is yours or it is that of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We have 6 minutes. We're going to speak for about 5 minutes, and then we'll give you a minute to close. I think there ought to be balance in terms of closing. We don't have to be exactly right in terms of time.

Before I yield to Mr. WESTMORELAND, let me say that we've got a factual disagreement about the Outer Continental Shelf as to what is available. This chart that's down by Mr. WESTMORELAND shows that 85 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is off limits. The entire coast of the Pacific is off limits. I believe the entire Atlantic coast is off limits. The western Gulf of Mexico, where we've been drilling for 60 years, is accessible, and I think some of the eastern Gulf may be accessible. So we have a factual discrepancy that should be resolvable before we do this again because it looks to me like most of the OCS, with the exception of the western Gulf of Mexico, is simply not available because of a congressional moratorium. Now, if we can agree on a bipartisan basis to change that, then we're going to create some areas for our oil companies to invest their funds domestically.

With that, I would like to yield to Mr. WESTMORELAND, who is one of the godfathers of this experiment this evening.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his participation and for his willingness to come here tonight and to lead it with the expertise that he has had as former chairman of Energy and Commerce and that he has now as the ranking member.

I also want to thank Mr. ALTMIRE for his willingness to participate, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan.

While we don't necessarily agree on a lot of the facts, I think it has been a good example of why we need to have committee hearings. I was glad to hear that the gentleman from Michigan's bill is going to actually have a markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee, so I think that's a positive step in that we're finally, hopefully, having the majority ask for the minority's input.

It does concern me a little bit as to what Speaker PELOSI said today in her quote, that she is going to continue to do these things under suspension. Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is out of fear that we will come back with a motion to recommit.

Let me say this: While we're talking about gas today, we cannot regulate ourselves out of this crisis. While we came down today to discuss, I thought, some U.S. oil production and drilling, it's good that we got into some of the other things that the majority is saying are causing these gas prices to go so high, but even from listening to them about this not affecting it immediately, we need to look to the future for our children and for our grandchildren. So I hope we'll continue this discussion.

Again, I want to thank all of the parties who participated.

Mr. ALTMIRE, I will yield back to you.

I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) would like to say something.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Yes. We'll let Mr. ALTMIRE have about 1 minute, and we'll let Dr. BURGESS have the last minute.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would yield to Dr. BURGESS at this point.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It has been a fascinating discussion tonight.

Of course, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, I was in the hearing as well on June 23rd. It was a long hearing, but it was a good hearing, and we heard from a number of witnesses.

When you listened to the discussion of the witnesses, especially on the concept of the non physical hedger, I think one of the most striking things to me was that there was a component, just the sheer volume of dollars, that was going into that, and that clearly had an effect, so there may be a very immediate return that can be had. There was a disagreement as to how quickly that could come about, but the pressure could be put on the price of oil to come down.

What was not lost on me, though, was the concept that these very tight supply and demand markets are around the world, and I think, man, those first four witnesses that presented to us that day said that by the year 2015, world demand would vastly outstrip supply. The message I took from that is we'd best be looking at the next level of supply because we had about a 7-year window in which to achieve that, so you had to be sure that some of these other methods that we've heard today would be several years down the road before we would actually get the supply from those areas, but we need to start today to be able to get that supply.

The other thing that was just absolutely amazing was the number of dollars going into those markets and where the actual rate of rise really began to increase. It was in about December of 2006 or in January of 2007.

I think my time has expired. I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND). I especially thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for these 2 hours.

This, I think, was very productive, very eventful. We had a good debate. Hopefully, this is not the last time that we will do this. I thank the Speaker for the time, for both this hour and for the previous hour.

At this point, I would yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KIND (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in district.

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. PEARCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and July 15 on account of business in New Mexico.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and July 15 on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTON of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, July 15, 16 and 17.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today, July 15 and 16.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MYRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and July 15.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California, for 5 minutes, July 15 and 16.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, July 15 and 16.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today, July 15, 16 and 17.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, July 15.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1046. An act to modify pay provisions relating to certain senior-level positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2967. An act to provide for certain Federal employee benefits to be continued for certain employees of the Senate Restaurants after operations of the Senate Restaurants are contracted to be performed by a private business concern, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on July 7, 2008 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 430. To designate the United States bankruptcy courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza East in Brooklyn, New York, as the 'Conrad B. Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse'.

H.R. 634. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

H.R. 781. To redesignate Lock and Dam No. 5 of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System near Redfield, Arkansas, authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act approved July 24, 1946, as the 'Colonel Charles D. Maynard Lock and Dam'.

H.R. 814. To require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue regulations mandating child-resistant closures on all portable gasoline containers.

H.R. 1019. To designate the United States customhouse building located at 31 Gonzalez Clemente Avenue in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the 'Rafael Martinez Nadal United States Customhouse Building'.

H.R. 2728. To designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 25762 Madison Avenue in Murrieta, California, as

the 'Theodore L. Newton, Jr. and George F. Azrak Border Patrol Station'.

H.R. 4140. To designate the Port Angeles Federal Building in Port Angeles, Washington, as the 'Richard B. Anderson Federal Building'.

H.R. 5778. To extend agricultural programs beyond March 15, 2008, to suspend permanent price support authorities beyond that date, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6040. To amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Army to provide reimbursement for travel expenses incurred by members of the Committee on Levee Safety.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 15, 2008, at 9 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7485. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas in New York [Docket No. APHIS-2007-0104] received July 2, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7486. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Manufactured Home Installation Program [Docket No. FR-4812-F-03] (RIN: 2502-AH97) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7487. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commission Guidance and Amendment to the Rules Relating to Organization and Program Management Concerning Proposed Rule Changes Filed by Self-Regulatory Organizations [Release No. 34-58092] received July 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7488. A letter from the Asst. Gen. Counsel for Reg. Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program and Other Federal Student Aid Programs [Docket ID ED-2008-OPE-0001] (RIN: 1840-AC93) received June 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7489. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7490. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Bylaws of the Pension Benefit

Guaranty Corporation — received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision of Refrigerant Recovery Only Equipment Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0231; FRL-8582-6] (RIN: 2060-AP18) received June 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7492. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Small Entity Compliance Guide to Renovate Right; EPA's Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair, and Painting Program; Notice of Availability [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2005-0049; FRL-8368-9] (RIN: 2070-AC83) received June 26, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7493. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Promotion of a More Efficient Capacity Release Market [Docket No. RM08-1-000; Order No. 712] received June 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7494. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Use of Meeting Rooms and Public Space [Docket NARA-08-0002] (RIN: 3095-AB33) received June 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7495. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska-2008-09 and 2009-10 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations [FWS-R7-SM-2008-0020; 70101-1261-0000L6] (RIN: 1018-AV69) received July 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7496. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing (End. Species, WO), Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Critical Habitat Revised Designation for the Kootenai River Population of the White Sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) [FWS-R1-ES-2008-0072] [92210-1117-0000-FY08-B4] (RIN: 1018-AU47) received July 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7497. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart C and Subpart D-2008-09 Subsistence Taking of Fish and Shellfish Regulations [FWS-R7-SM-2008-0021; 70101-1335-0064L6] (RIN: 1018-AU71) received July 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7498. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA-151-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2008-0013] received July 2, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7499. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for 2008 Summer Period [Docket

No. 071030625-7696-02] (RIN: 0648-XI40) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7500. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No. 080129098-8743-02] (RIN: 0648-AW45) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7501. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 071106671-8010-02] (RIN: 0648-XI13) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7502. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole by Vessels Participating in the Amendment 80 Limited Access Fishery in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 071106673-8011-02] (RIN: 0648-XI07) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7503. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea bass fisheries; Fishing Year 2008 [Docket No. 070717341-8549-02] (RIN: 0648-AV41) received June 23, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7504. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Board of Immigration Appeals: Composition of Board and Temporary Board Members [EOIR Docket No. 158F; AG Order No. 2975-2008] (RIN: 1125-AA57) received June 26, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7505. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Swans Island, ME [Docket No. FAA-2008-0060; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-91] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7506. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Fort Kent, ME [Docket No. FAA-2008-0059; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-90] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7507. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gettysburg, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-0309; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-20] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7508. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff

Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30600; Amdt. No. 3262] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7509. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30603; Amdt. No. 3265] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7510. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30609; Amdt. No. 3270] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7511. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30602; Amdt. No. 3264] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7512. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30611; Amdt. No. 3272] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7513. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30612; Amdt. No. 3273] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7514. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30610; Amdt. No. 3271] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7515. A letter from the Senior Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Railroad Operating Rules: Program of Operational Tests and Inspections; Railroad Operating Practices: Handling Equipment, Switches and Fixed Derails [Docket No. FRA-2006-25267] (RIN: 2130-AB76) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7516. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — DISCLOSURE OF RAIL INTERCHANGE COMMITMENTS [STB Ex Parte No. 575 (Sub-No. 1)] received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7517. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff

Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30569; Amdt. No. 3235] received June 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7518. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Franklin, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-0279; Airspace Docket No. 070-AEA-19] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7519. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Swans Island, ME [Docket No. FAA-2008-0060; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-91] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7520. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Vinalhaven, ME. [Docket No. FAA-2008-0061; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-92] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7521. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bridgton, ME. [Docket No. FAA-2008-0064; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-95] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7522. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Water Transfers Rule [EPA-HQ-OW-2006-0141; FRL-8579-3] (RIN: 2040-AE86) received June 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7523. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT [USCBP-2008-0060 CBP Dec. 08-22] (RIN: 1505-AB84) received June 9, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7524. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — ARTICLES ASSEMBLED ABROAD: OPERATIONS INCIDENTAL TO THE ASSEMBLY PROCESS [CBP Dec. 08-21] (RIN: 1505-AB90) received June 9, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7525. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.204: Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Also, Part 1, 471, 472; 1.471-2, 1.471-8, 1.472-1) (Rev. Proc. 2008-43) received June 26, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7526. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Auction Rate Preferred Stock-Effect of Liquidity Facilities on Equity Character [Notice 2008-55] received June 26, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7527. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Alternative Simplified Credit under Section 41(c)(5) [TD 9401] (RIN: 1545-BH33) received

June 24, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[The following action occurred on July 11, 2008]

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 5618. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-701 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Omitted from the Record of July 10, 2008]

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5170. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for a privacy official within each component of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3227. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area; with amendments (Rept. 110-756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5057. a bill to reauthorize the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program; with amendments (Rept. 110-757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1339. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 415) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. 110-758). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 6481. A bill to create a civil action to provide judicial remedies to carry out certain treaty obligations of the United States under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 6482. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to establish both a process by which asset-backed instruments can be deemed eligible for NRSRO ratings and an initial list of such eligible asset-backed instruments; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 6483. A bill to provide for duty free treatment of certain recreational performance outerwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-

in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 6484. A bill to provide for a study of measures to achieve energy independence for the United States without adversely affecting the environment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR:

H.R. 6485. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that disability determinations under such title on the basis of hearings by the Commissioner of Social Security are made on a timely basis and to require the Commissioner to establish a program for monitoring each year the number of disability determinations which are in reconsideration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 6486. A bill to prohibit the manufacture, marketing, sale, or shipment in interstate commerce of products designed to assist in defrauding a drug test; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GIFFORDS:

H.R. 6487. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a temporary reduction in the tax imposed on diesel fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 6488. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a final consumer product safety rule banning novelty lighters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HOOLEY:

H.R. 6489. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 4th Street in Lake Oswego, Oregon, as the "Judie Hammerstad Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 6490. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote the safe use of the Internet by students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H. Res. 1340. A resolution recognizing the 358th Fighter Group for its outstanding service and bravery during World War II and commending its successor, the 122nd Fighter Wing, for continuing its legacy of excellence in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 160: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 303: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 471: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 690: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 699: Mr. COBLE and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 772: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 777: Ms. CASTOR.

H.R. 981: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 996: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 997: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1050: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1073: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1108: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1157: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1176: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1436: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 1524: Mr. CAZAYOUX.
 H.R. 1527: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 1589: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 1621: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 1746: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. FILNER and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 1770: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 1827: Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2092: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LAMPSON.
 H.R. 2116: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 2169: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 2205: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 2208: Mr. McCOTTER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 2289: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2325: Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 2472: Mr. SPACE.
 H.R. 2495: Mr. SHADEGG.
 H.R. 2677: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
 H.R. 2958: Ms. FALLIN.
 H.R. 3202: Mr. SIREs and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 3212: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 3257: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 3289: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3366: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3407: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3485: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 3634: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3679: Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 3689: Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 3820: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 4021: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4544: Mr. LATTI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. McINTYRE.
 H.R. 4651: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 4930: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 5161: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 5235: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 5265: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 5425: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 5446: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 5488: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5635: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5652: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 5684: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 5709: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 5734: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 5752: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 5762: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5782: Mr. McHENRY.
 H.R. 5785: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5797: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 5798: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5812: Mrs. MYRICK and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 5833: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5836: Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 5892: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H.R. 5898: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5901: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5914: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 5950: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 5954: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5965: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6029: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 6045: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 6076: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 6078: Mr. FALLOMAVAEGA and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6107: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 6108: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 6122: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 6140: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 6143: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 6163: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 6210: Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 6217: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 6228: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6239: Mr. ROSS and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 6248: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 6258: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 6282: Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 6288: Mr. PAUL and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 6292: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 6293: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 6298: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 6310: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
 H.R. 6339: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 6365: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 6368: Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 6371: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 6387: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 6391: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 6393: Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 6399: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 6403: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 6407: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FARR, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
 H.R. 6411: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
 H.R. 6418: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 6439: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 6445: Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 6446: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 6452: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 6465: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 6473: Mr. HALL of New York.
 H.R. 6476: Ms. BEAN and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.J. Res. 12: Mr. DONNELLY.
 H.J. Res. 39: Mr. GERLACH and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.J. Res. 84: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. McCOTTER.
 H.J. Res. 93: Mr. SIREs.
 H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. SOUDER.
 H. Con. Res. 214: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H. Con. Res. 360: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FILNE, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H. Con. Res. 361: Ms. FOXF.
 H. Con. Res. 369: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 371: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Con. Res. 376: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BACA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HODES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H. Con. Res. 378: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H. Con. Res. 380: Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Con. Res. 381: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. ACKERMAN and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 386: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H. Con. Res. 388: Ms. FALLIN.
 H. Res. 671: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H. Res. 758: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. SHAYS.
 H. Res. 883: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 1008: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. WU.
 H. Res. 1019: Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 1078: Mr. STARK and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 1177: Mr. HOLT.
 H. Res. 1179: Mr. WAMP.
 H. Res. 1200: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SPRATT, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Res. 1227: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SIREs.
 H. Res. 1245: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 1261: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FARR, Mr. Ellsworth, Mr. WATT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. HARE, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H. Res. 1266: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H. Res. 1273: Mr. KAGEN.
 H. Res. 1282: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H. Res. 1287: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. POE, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Res. 1289: Mr. ELLISON.
 H. Res. 1290: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H. Res. 1296: Mr. ISSA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H. Res. 1301: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 1306: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. POE, and Mr. TANNER.
 H. Res. 1310: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 1311: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
 H. Res. 1316: Mr. WOLF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H. Res. 1319: Mr. WOLF and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Res. 1324: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H. Res. 1328: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. FERGUSON.
 H. Res. 1329: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H. Res. 1330: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H. Res. 1337: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. MARKEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

for Fiscal year 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

The amendment to be offered by Representative SILVESTRE REYES, or a designee, to H.R. 5959, the Intelligence authorization